THE DIALOGVES OF WILLIAM RICHWORTH

OR

The iudgmend of common ſenſe in the choiſe of Religion.



Printed at *Paris* by IOHN MESTAIS, 1640.

S. LD
8° R. 6
Th.

THE DIALOGUES
OF
WILLIAM RICHWORTH
READER
OR
The judgment of common
reason in the choice of
Religion.

TO THE READER.

Mr William Richworth *borne in* Lincolneshire *studied in the English College at* Doway, *there was made Priest, and afterwards discharged the place and office of* Prefect *with much commendation, all which time he was knowne by the name of Charles Rosse. Comming into England he lived in diuers places with good esteeme vntill the yeare* 1637 *in which he dyed. He was a man curious in* Diuinitie, Controuersies, Mathematikes, *and* Physicke, *but cheefely delighted in* Mathematickes, *and by the name of Robinson entertained correspondence with the learned* Oughtred. *He affected the rigor of mathematicall discourse euen in his controuersies, as you may*

perceiue by this worke, and thought no man truly learned but who aymed to doe the like. These Dialogues he framed some yeares agone, and shewed them to seuerall friends of his, which finding they gaue content to diuers iudicious persons, he intended to enlarge and publish the, but hindered by some occasions so that he could not finish and perfect them before his death he bequeathed his papers and this charge to a friend, to whome he had often communicated his designe. Here now you haue them deuided into three parts. The first containing and declaring how and what points of controuersies are of necessitie. The second shewing that scripture alone is not a fitt iudge nor able of it self to decide controuersies in Religion. The third and last demonstrates an euident and infalible meanes of determining and deciding all questios and disputs of faith and Religion, which God grant may be to your profit.

THE APPROBATION.

HAuing perused and considered by leaue and order from our sacred facultie of Diuinitie a little treatise entitled *The Dialogues of William Risbworth, or the iudgment of common sense in the choise of Religion*, containing 36. sheetes in writing, and 24. printed in 12. we doe certifie that there is not anie thing contained therein against Catholike faith or Christian pietie, but manie rationall and connaturall proofes and motiues of them both. And therefore doe iuge it truly worthie our Approbation and the publicke. Paris this 7. of Aprill 1640.

E. TYRELL. H. HOLDEN.

The Printer's ignorance of the English tongue hath caused manie errors in the print, amongst others these

Pag. 87.	9r. cor. 95.	236. acd, cor. and	
101.	at. cor. a	254. posseth, cor.	
104.	the, cor. these.	passeth	
109.	hath, cor. have	309. ou, cor. out	
112.	söe be saued cor.	386. although cor.	
	some may be saued	although	
113.	the, cor. that's	434. doktine, cor.	
119.	hath, cor. had	doctrine.	
124.	waine, cor. waine	459. you, cor. your	
132.	tiemb, cor. teeth	481. luch, cor. luch	
164.	in Gouer. &c.	as	
	cor. in Gouer &c.	508. title, cor. litle	
149.	hat, cor. that	516. af, cor. of	
160.	her, cor. an	527. prit. cor. part	
162.	an, cor. an	528. be, cut the	
171.	th. cor. that	not, nor &c.	
186.	taule, cor. reade	545. de cor. doe	
361.	Iffe	546. theſes, cor. theſe	
387.	Religions order	553. pleaſont, cor.	
	cor. religious	pleaſant.	

THE FIRST DIALOGVE.

What pointes of controuerſie in matters of Religion are to be Knowne of neceſſitie?

This Dialogue containeth 12. parts or paragraphes.

1. *THe Preface or Introduction.*
2. *Whence procedeth and dependeth the neceſſitie of knowing pointes of Religion?*
3. *That the pointes wherein the Arrians and other antient Heretickes differred from the Catholike church were pointes of neceſſitie to*

be knowne and beleeued.

4. That the beliefe of the Hierarchie eſtabliſſed by Chriſt in his church is of neceſſitie.

5. That the adminiſtration of Sacraments by the Hierarchie is likewiſe of neceſſitie.

6. That the reſolutions of Generall Councells are to decide controuerſies both in pointes of neceſſitie and of indifferencie.

7 That the maintenance of the vnitie of the church is of neceſſitie.

8. That ſome things may be of neceſſitie in a lower degree, and in particular the vſe of pictures.

9. That the honnoring of Saincts, their Canonization, and the inſtitution of Reli-

gious orders are neceſſarie in this ſame degree.

10. That the Sacraments of order and Matrimonie, the Generalitie of Ceremonies, and the opinion of miracles are alſoe neceſſarie.

11. That prayer for the dead, Extreme vnction, and Confeſsion bee likewiſe neceſſarie.

12. That good inſtitutions are not to bee giuen ouer for ſmale inconueniencies, the abuſes are to be mended, not the things taken awaie, and therefore that the partie which broke communion is the other.

THE INTRODVCTION.

§. 1. NEPHEW. Come, vncle, this is the first day of the new yeare, and therefore me thinke's it would be a great offence to imploye it wholy in Pastimes, and not giue some hansell to vertue by some serious and good discourse, which may engage, and serue me for a Paterne of well doeing all the yeare after. Wherefore though it be late, yet I know vncle, that you (whose well spent age and trauailles haue made you able and fitt to giue

light and guydance to my vnſetled yeares) can preſently giue me ſuch a leſſon as that I ſhall eaſily better my ſelfe thereby all the yeare following.

Vncle. I ſhould be verie vnkind, louing cozē, if I ſhould refuſe ſuch a requeſt to you, whom the mariage of my neereſt and deareſt kinſwoman maketh me loue and tender as one who hath myne owne blood and ioye in his care and cuſtodie. But as I am glad to ſee this inclination in you, which I hope will ſtrengthen with your age, ſo doth the choiſe of the time you make, being now the hoateſt ſeaſon of the day for gaming, make me wonder at your vnuſuall temperance.

Nephew. Yesternight was the end of the last yeare, and so I made euen with the world, nor haue I as yet begun againe, and therefore I tooke occasion to withdraw my self when the companie sate downe to playe, with intention to bestow somewhat better the litle that's left of this good day.

Vncle. Why then, cozen, I thinke I know my theame, you lost all your monies yesternight, and now you are wearie with looking on others all this day, and therefore I must tell you how damageable and fruitlesse a thing play is, especially to yong gentlemen who are coming, or newly come to their estats. speake plainely, sweete cozen, is it not so?

Nephew. In deede, Vncle, for the first part you haue hitt verie right, but for the latter I shall entreate you not to touch vpon that string at this time, at least vntill the twelft-day bee passed. For my father promised me monies when myne were lost, and you know how sweete reuenge is, so that I shall be in a better dispositiō to heare you discourse of this subiect after Christmasse when all the companie is gone. What you should now saie of this matter, would be, I feare, a bitter and distastfull pill without effect, my disease being at this present in it's crisis, Anie thing els will take much better, I shall profit more, and you will be in lesse danger to loose your labour.

Vncle. Well, cozen, seing you are vnwilling of that discourse I will not trouble you therewith, vpon condition that after twelftide you will not faille to come to me with preparation to receiue that doome which I shall laye vpon you for your christmasse tresp̃asses. In the interim I conceiue nothing more fitting then to informe you of the cheefest and most important affaire that you can haue vpon earth. You know you haue beene borne and bred a catholike, And you know it is their beliefe and *tenent* that all wee catholikes are obliged to venter life and fortunes for the profession of our faith. Is it not then a great [illegible]me for a catholike

gentleman to know full well how to gouerne his temporall estate, till his grounds, breede his catell, sollicite his suits in law, and menage all his terrestriall affaires, and not knowe Why in such an occasion he ought to hazard, yea and if neede be, to loose and cast all awaye in the verie sight of his lamenting friends, some vpbraiding and some condemning his action as foolish and indiscreete?

Nephew. I pray, vncle, doe not laye so hard a censure vpō me, nor thinke me so ignorant of those things with out the knowledge where of. I cannot be a catholike. And you know wee cannot be admitted to the Sacraments, nor can we be esteemed and re-

puted catholikes vnleſſe we believe that the reward we expect in heauen is farr beyond the pleaſures of this world. And truly conſidering what Chriſt Ieſus hath done and ſuffered for vs, it were moſt baſe and vnworthie of a gratefull ſoule to feare to yeild vp life and goods when it is for his honnor and glorie. Nordoe I thinke that more violent and efficacious reaſons and motiues can be giuen to a noble hart then theſe. I cõfeſſe if you would ſearch into the metaphyſicall grounds and principles of theſe truths, I should perhaps light short of giuing a full accounte, but my age and naturall vnſtedfaſtneſſe pleade my excuſe as yet, per-

aduenture when I grow elder I may proue more bookish and then turne the scripture and fathers, and so become able to giue a more sollide accompte of our *tenents*, but as yet this is not to be expected at my hands.

Vncle. Feare not, cozen, anie hard measure from me Who loue you so tenderly, neither is that the point I entended to deliuer vnto you. But sithence the greatter part of your kinred are of a different beliefe from you, I desire to enable you to giue them satisfaction why you adhere so strongly to the Catholike partie, as to hazard your owne and posteritie's wellfare for the maintenãce of your faith and profession. Nether am

I ignorāt of your youthfull disposition, and therefore Will I abstaine from misticall and sublime metaphysikes, and only, or at least cheefely make vse of what you know alreadie, and what common sense and ordinarie naturall reason is able to performe. wherefore to make the first breach, I praye tell me, cozē, what answere would you giue to a neere friend Who should blame you for ruining your estate in the defence and maintenance of a position which is against the iudgment of your kinred, friends, countrie, and state?

Nephew. I would laye opē vnto him how that our church and our doctrine hath beene euer preached and taught

from Christ's time in all countries of the world, what abūdance of holy martyres and learned men wee haue had, how all christian nations haue beene conuerted by vs, and such like motiues, which are able to secure anie Wise man from doubting, and must needes conuince the truth to be on our side, our Aduersaries being but vpstarts of an hundreth yeares old. Which if anie should cōtest, and denye these things to be true, I would offer to produce men who should proue and iustifie all I said against anie Doctor he should bring.

Vncle. Verie well, but if your friend reply, that they willingly cōfesse these things haue beene done by the common

Anceſtours of both Catholikes and Proteſtāts, which were the true church, but manie errours by litle and litle haue encroached and crept in amongſt thē, which whē they were diſcouered, thoſe who now adhere to the Romā church would not acknowledge, but through obſtinacie and deſire of ſoueraigntie brake communion. And farther that theſe diuiſions are not truly diuiſions in Religion but in opinion; ſo that both ſides remaine ſtill parts of the true church, though ſo much trāſported by their firſt heates and paſſions as that cauſeleſly they denye communion one to the other. And, ſaie's he, if you looke in to the pointes of theſe diuiſiōs, they

are but such as be in the Roman church it selfe betwixt *Thomists* and *Scotists*, *Dominicans* and *Iesuits*, who proceede so farr as to charge one an other with *Pelagianisme* and *Caluinisme*, which neuertheleſſe doth not make different churches, euen by the Catholikes owne confeſſion. And why then should the Proteſtants be of an other church then the Catholikes are of? What would you auſwere to this?

Neph. W. I am not so ignorãt but I see well enough that all manner of differences ought not to make a breach in churches, and yet that some may. For I see men goe to law and haue quarells, and both partyes not only tollerated in the

W
diffe
ces
Rel
mal
sch

in the common wealth, but held good mẽbers of it. And yet others I see punished for their quarells and contentions. And if I doe not mistake the reason of this disparitie is, that as long as these quarells are betwixt priuate mẽ, so long they are suffered and borne withall, but if once the common wealth take part with one side, giuing iudgmẽt in the cause disputed and thereby intereſſe it ſelf in the busines, if then the other side yeild not, it is iustly accounted punishable and an euill member of the commonwealth. And in deede thus to disagree vnder a head or rule which can bring the disagreers to agreement, is rather to agree then disagree, becaus they

agree in a thing (towit in a mutually acknowledged head and cõmon rule) which is ſtrõger thẽ the cauſes of their diſagreemẽt, and therefore their diſageement is only for a time, vntill that head and rule haue a conuenient and fitt opportunitie to reduce the diſagreers to a full and totall agreement. This dayly experience teacheth vs in our owne commonwealth, which hauing once giuen a finall ſentẽce and determinate iudgment betwixt partye and partie the ſuite is ended, and who ſhould diſobey would be punished for contempt. So likewiſe in the church, which is a ſpirituall common wealth, ſuch differences as be amongſt thoſe who referre them

ſelues to hir iudgment, and acknowledge hir deciſiue authoritie, are and may be tollerated to what termes ſoeuer the partyes growe amongſt them ſelues. But ſuch differences as trench vpon hir authoritie, and are betwixt thoſe whereof the one partye will not acknowledge hir defining power, nor ſtand to hir iudgment, ſuch differences, I ſaye, make Aliens and deſerue to be cutt of from communion.

Vncle. You haue diſcurſed well, but not home at leaſt to the ſecond part of the replye, about the pointes them ſelues, whether they be but matters of opinion or no, what ſaye you to that?

Nephew. That alſo is eui-

dent to me, to witt that the pointes disputed betwixt Catholikes and Protestants are most materiall and substātiall ones. For suppose Christ's bodie be truly and really in the Blessed Sacrament, and that t'is God him self which the Priest sheweth the people to adore, it suerly can be no slight offence not to giue him due honnor; nor contrariewise no smale crime to adore that for God which truly is not so. If Christ haue left the authoritie of *gouerment* to Bishops, of *Absolution* from sinnes to Priests, it is no indifferent nor pettit busines to take thē out of the church. If it be Idolatrie to hōnor images, praye to Saincts, and the like, can we thinke it no great mat-

ter whether we doe so or no, seing the scripture full of so manie plagues faling vpon the Iewes for Idolatrie?

Vncle. Why, cozen. may not a Protestant answere you likewise, that if one of the opinions controuerted betwixt *Thomists* and *Scotists* be *Pelagianisme* the other *Caluinisme*, can you thinke that such pointes are of smale importance? Wherefore he will tell you, that all such pointes are verie hard questions, graue, learned, and vnpassionate men on both sides, and therefore what so euer the truth be in it self, yet so long as God Allmightie see's our harts to be right towards him, and that we desire to doe what his law teacheth vs, so farr as

we are able to know it, all these and the like opinions are but only materiall errors, and doe not hinder vs from being good Christians.

Nephew. Truly, Vncle, you haue puzled me now, for vnlesse such pointes and questions doe trench vpon the churche's authoritie, why should not the church beare with such opinions, but so seuerely cast them out of communion, ad shutt heauen gates vpon the Authours and Beginners of them? Certes vnlesse there be some necessitie why certaine pointes are to be knowne by the whole church, others not, I confesse I cannot answere you, but I come to learne, and therefore when my owne discourse rea-

cheth not, I must craue your helping hand to direct me. And I shall thinke the yeare well hanselled if you make me vnderstand what pointes are to be knowne of necessitie and why? but first, I pray, tell me

§. 2. *Whence proceedeth and dependeth the necessitie of knowing pointes of Religion?*

VNCLE. To sett you in the waye you must first tell me what you thinke this word *necessitie* doth importe, so farr as it concerne's our pourpose?

Nephew. You know I am no great clarke, and therefore I cannot speake of *necessitie*, nether as a Gramarian nor

as a Logician, but as farr as I vnderstand and intende by my question, there is two sortes of *necessities*, the one so absolute as that the thing we desire cannot without such a meanes be anie waies gotten or done; the other in respect of such a meanes without the which our desire cannot bee well and conueniently obtained. For we commonly saie that such or such a thing cannot be done or gotten, when it is extreme hard and painefull to gett it. And therefore some times we call *that necessarie* without which our desire cannot be fullfilled but with great labour and difficultie, and some times *that*, without which it cannot absolutely be compassed.

Vncle. Mary, cozen, you neede nether Gramarian nor Logician to helpe you, nor to mende what you hane said. But since you are so skilfull, and that you now see what is necessarie in generall, to witt *the know ledge of Christian doctrine*, and what it is to be *necessarie*, I will trouble you with a farther demãde, giuing you first this *caueat*, That my intention is not to examine or declare what expresse and distinct knowledge or beliefe ought euerie particular and indiuiduall man to haue, whithout which he cannot possibly be saued, this being a thing depending of so manie secret and vnknowne circumstances, as that it seemeth to be specialy reserued as only befitting

The necessitie of knowing points of faith is to be compared to a church or cõpanie of beliuers and not to euerie particular man.

befitting God's infinite wisdome and deuine iustice. though some times a prudent man may shrodly guesse, and in a possible supposition of a particular mans dying without repentance in a positiue and wilfull contradicting beliefe to the doctrine of the Catholike church, it would be no breach of charitie to conclude his dãnation. Yet at this present we will only speake of the *necessitie* of knowing and beliouing seuerall controuerted poinres of Christian doctrine in respect of a church or cõpanie of professed Christians in cõmon, and not as the knowledge thereof is necessarie to euerie particular man. Now therefore tell me, what is the end for which

this knowledge of Christian doctrine is necessarie?

How he knowledge of Christian doctrine cometh to be necessarie to salvation.

Nephew. That I suppose no man doubteh but it is heauen, or in more learned termes, the sight or true and proper knowledge of Almightie God, who being the cause and Creator of All things, he that clearely see's and truly know's him, will see and know all other things in him, which all together fall so farr short of giuing such content as is taken by seeing him that the sight of him is only accompted Blisse, and the sight of all the rest is but a retenue and conuenience of that first and cheefe sight, which of it self alone is our essentiall Happinesse.

Vncle. This I confesse, co-

zen, is both verie true and verie well said of you, but yet I must haue an other answere: for sure you haue ouer-skipp't some thing. What connection is there, I pray, betwixt the knowledge of Christian doctrine and seeing of Almightie God? Some thing, I saie, must of necessitie be betwixt them, for which, what soeuer it be, the knowledge of Christian doctrine will be more immediately necessarie. Which if you can tell me what it is, we shall thereby more easily discouer and conceiue what and how farr this knowledge of Christian doctrine is necessarie for vs.

Nephew. Why, vncle, you know I haue beene taught no farther then to know what I

ought to beleiue and doe, and that in beleiuing and doeing so, I shall come to heauen.

Vnde. And were you not taught that the commandements were resumed and cõprehended in two, to wit in the loue of God and of your neighbour?

Nephew. Yes that I was, but what that appertaine's to your question, that I vnderstand not, vnlesse peraduenture your meaning be, that the accomplishment of these two laues is the immediate stepp to our Blisse. Which as I see t'is verie likely, yet doe I not fully conceiue why it should be so, vnlesse heauē goe by wishing, whereas I haue still beene taught it goe's by working, and that violence must carrie it.

Vnle. Did you neuer take notice of your selfe, how that if you harken to a discourse of anie thing which you vehemētly desire to know how attentiue you are? how fearefull that anie word should slippe vnheard or not vnderstood? how quiet you keepe all your thoughts? how still and vntroubled your phantsie? that what you heare may sinke downe into your soule as distinctly, and in the same frame and order as it floweth from the speaker? So you see that the loue or desire to know anie thing is the most efficacious disposition we can haue to attaine to the knowledge thereof. Now you know that this life and conuersation of the soule in her

bodie is giuen hir to prepare and dispose hir selfe for the next life, Is it not therefore euident that that soule which most desire's to see and know God, that is, which most loueth God, in this life, and particularly in the time of hir departure out of this world, goe's out of hir bodie with the best and perfectest preparation and disposition to see and know God in the life to come, which is our expected and eternall happinesse; Nor is this against what you haue beene taught, for loue is the most actiue and consequently the most violent thing in the world, and therefore if heauē must be obtained by violēce, loue certainely must be the waye. Wherefore you see, we

are to considere the necessitie of controuerted pointes of Religion in as much as of their owne nature and of thē selues they doe cause and make professours of christianitie to loue God, and desire to see him. For sithēce this loue and desire is the meanes and waye to heauen, it must needes follow that according as anie pointe or position doth produce or contribute to this effect in the soules of Christians, the necessitie of such a pointe must bee of the same degree. There is a necessitie of believing all points of faith in generall, out of an other principle, to witt, in that the church proposeth them vnto vs as such, which we must accept and believe in all or not

ne, being the same reason and motiue in all, but this I shall take occasion an other time to shew vnto you. You will saie peraduenture if this be so, what needes the knowledge of Christian doctrine? can there be imagined a greatter motiue of loue then that God is, and that he is goodnesse it selfe? Is not this alone a sufficiēt motiue to make all creatures melt into the loue of him? And this suerly may be knowne by pure naturall reasō. Why thē is the knowledge of pointes disputed betwixt the Protestants and vs to be held necessarie? Nay to what end must we needes know anie part of Christ's law for the attaining of Blisse, since loue will doe it, and the most

efficacious motiue of loue is to be had with out it?

Nephew. You haue posed me now, for truly I see that goodneesse is able to rauish all the harts in the world, and this is so cleere and common that it neede's no proofe. Wherefore me thinke's if me would considere and follow this motiue of God's infinite goodnesse, they would not want loue, and not wanting loue, according to your discourse, they must of necessitie attaine to euerlasting Blisse and Happinesse. Why therefore ame other knowledge should be absolutly necessarie I see not, much lesse doe I conceiue wherefore we should thinke

That the pointes wherein the §. 3.

Arrians and other Antient Heretikes differed from Catholikes are pointes of necessitie to be knowne and beleiued.

Why God's goodnes se as knowable by nature is not a sufficiēt motiue of loue to all mankinde.

VNCLE. What thinke you, cozen, if the motiue of loue which we speake of, were such, as that few men and great clarkes only were able to reach and conceiue it, not consequently be moued and affected with it? Doe you thinke some other motiue more easie, more generall, and more common, were not necessarie, whereby the people and ordinarie sort of men might be moued and affected? Or doe you thinke that mankinde could be said to haue sufficient meanes toattaine

to Bliſſe and Happineſſe, if it had only ſuch an *one*, as that verie few could make vſe of? And that you may the better conceiue my queſtion, putt the caſe, that on the one ſide there were ſuch a meanes as that verie few could reach vnto it, on the other ſide ſuch an one as were accommodated to the capacitie of euerie man, doe you not ſee, that to ſaie mankynde may be ſaued by *this* or *that* meanes, hath a quite different ſenſe? Mankynde in the one ſignifying the whole multitude, in the other a ſmale, or as it were no part of the multitude. For that part of anie thing which is ſo litle as that it beareth no morall proportion to the whole, is, in our manner of ſpeaking,

accounted as none. Doe you not then see that it is necessarie that the meanes of our salvation be of this more generall and common nature?

Nephew. I doubt it not, and myne owne interest make's me more inclined thereunto, being, God knowe's, I am of the weaker sort. And when I consid ere the good of salvation, and the harme and misere which followeth the losse of it, and that we all acknowledge euerie mā to be capable thereof, t'is euident that the meanes of attaining such an infinite *good*, wherevnto we are all ordained, ought to reach and lye within the power of all, or at least, of the most part of men. But yet I see not why the infinite goodnesse of God

is not a motiue sufficiently generall and common to moue and affect all the world.

Vncle. Why, cozen, you must considere that there be as it were three stepps or degrees by which we goe or tende to anie *good*. The *first*, to apprehende or vnderstand what it is, The *second* to conceiue and esteeme it, And the *third* to desire and pourſue it, And in the proſecution thereof to preferre it before all other goods which deſerue not ſo well, and in our caſe to preferre it before all other goods whatſoeuer, as being the greateſt of all. Theſe three degrees be ſo diſpoſed, as that the laſt cannot ſtand nor be putt without the ſecond, nor the ſecond without the firſt,

Three degrees of tending to anie good.

though contrarie wise the first may be without the second, and the second without the third by reason of man's weakneſſe. Now if you conſidere that *God Allmightie* and his *goodneſſe* is the moſt ſimple, ſublime, and abſtract thing that cā poſſibly be imagined, And reflect but vpon the nature of Angells, or of a ſoule, nay euē of a corporall ſubſtance ſeperated from all his ſenſible accidents, and if you had the experience that I haue, you would ſaie it were hard euen for the beſt witts to apprehēde rightly, and diſcourſe conſequently of theſe things. And ſhall we not then thinke that t'is ether abſolutely impoſſible, or extremely difficile to make the groſſer ſort

How hard it is to conceiue God's goodneſſe or anie ſpirituall thing.

of men apprehēde or vnderſtande anie thing likely or to the pourpoſe of *God* and his *goodneſſe*? Suerly wee maye. And the reaſon is, becauſe ſenſe and ſenſible obiects are the perpetuall matter and ſubiect wherein our vnderſtandings are exerciſed, not only in our childhood and youth, but euē in our whole life, vnleſſe ſome few by the ſtudie of metaphyſikes doe eleuate their vnderſtandings aboue the ordinarie pitch of mē and courſe of nature. And therefore it muſt needes be hard, and as it were impoſſible, that the greateſt part of mankinde ſhould be able to frame anie fitting and likely conceite or Idea of *Almightie God*, or of his *goodneſſe*. Looke but vpon the Iewes,

who had this knowledge inculcated into them by perpetuall miracles and Prophetes, and yet they could not keepe thē ſelues long frō running after Idoles, becauſe they had nothing to entertaine their phanſie and their ſenſible manner of vnderſtanding. And now if you call to minde the common ſaying of philoſophers that *nihil eſt volitum quod non ſit præcognitum*, to which is Parallell the Poet's Apopthegme *quod oculis ſunt in amore duces*, you ſhall finde that what is not well rooted and imprinted in the *vnderſtanding*, can neuer be deepely fixed in the *will*, nor conſequently the *will* efficaciouſly moued and affected by it. And that *nothing*, and *I know*

not what are of the same force and effect in our case, according to Aristotle's maxime, that in *respect of love* it is all one *not to be*, and *not to be known*, it must necessarily follow that the greatest part of men being not able to make anie strong and deepe conceite of *God* and his *goodnesse*, that t'is not possible they should be efficaciously moued and affected therewith. And if a preacher after a lóg discourse of the *loue of God*, and of his great benefits towards vs in the order of nature, could not giue a satisfactorie accounte, by reason of the weakenesse of his Auditory, to one that should aske him *what is God*, or *what is he* that hath donne all these things for vs: Would not

his learned labours vanish into a dreame, and the people goe awaye as from a playe where they wept at a thing which concerned them not, and were no longer caried awaye then whileſt they ſate hearing? I could cite a witneſſe and name a gentlewoman of your acquaintãce, of as ſweete a nature and as pure an vnderſtanding as is to be found amongſt a thouſand, with whom having ſometimes occaſion to diſcourſe about the ſtate of the next life, she hath often tould me, that shee believed all thoſe fine things, having euer beene taught shee muſt doe ſo, but that they ſeemed to hir as things in a dreame, for, quoth shee, I shall neuer be able to cõceiue

what a ſoule is, when all the bodie is taken awaye.

Nephew. Truly, vncle, you haue quite conuinced me, for as I ſee men talke of nothing more familiarly then of *God* and his *goodneſſe*, ſo likewiſe I ſee that if they diſcourſe but of an *Angell*, they preſently conceite him to haue a bodie and wings. And if one would force them out of it, they would be beſides themſelues. So that in verie deede not one in ten thouſand can make anie right cõceite of ſpirituall things. And if you talke to the common people of heauẽ they conceiue it but a drie thing to ſitt looking vpon God Allmightie and ſinging Pſalmes for all eternitie.

Vncle. Well then, cozen, this

Whether knowledge of the Incarnation is necessarie

being so, that God's goodnesse is so abstract and sublime as that vetie few can ether know or loue it sufficiently in it selfe, Suppose Allmigtie God of his infinite mercie and goodnesse towards vs, hath so tempered and abessed this too high and inconceiuable obiect by taking man's nature vpon him, and hath thereby made it palpable and tractable euen to the weakest and grosseſt vnderstandings, in so much that anie man, how dull soeuer, may with sensible facilitie fixe his minde and loue vpon it: Nay if he hath adioyned there vnto the greateſt causes of loue that hart can wish and beare, to witt the paines and sufferings of his sacred life and bitter death pra-

stized vpon his diuine person as he was man, the tender expressions whereof we find recorded in the holy historie of the Gospell, can we thinke that who take's this pointe of *God's Incarnation* out of the church and world, by ether denying or doubting of it, but that he doth moue an *Important stone*, and that this dogme can be no lesse then of extreme and maine necessitie?

Nephew. Certes no, 'tis cleere in my minde, not only what you saye, but also that such a man as would wrest out this corner stone and pull downe this pillar of the church, what soere he prat's of Christ, and beare's his name in shew, in truth and veritie is no Christian. For he takes

awaye Christ, and Annullate's his coming. Whereforeif there be ante such, no sword, no fire, no torment sufficient to exterminate him, no auersion, no horror, no abomination great enough to make true Christians auoide him.

The varieties of the Orientall errours against Christ's being God and man.

Vncle. I commende your zeale. Now therefore cast your eyes vpon the orientall Heresies which antiētly raigned, whereof some denyed Christ to be *God*, some denyed him to be *man*, some said he was nether *God* nor *man* but a third thing made of both, And some said that he was two things whereof the one was *God*, the other was *man*. All agreed in this, that the same person was not truly *God* and *man*, and consequently tooke

awaye this efficacious meanes and pregnant motiue of loue, that God did doe and suffer for vs those sensible and easily conceiued benefitts which he could not vnlesse he were *man*. And in this consisteth the greate and maine helpe of humane nature, that by and in the person of a *true* and *sensible man* wee might fixe our harts and setle our vtmost desires vpon our eternall good and happinesse. We may therefore conclude with S. Iohn, that *whosoeuer dissolueth Christ is Antychrist*, Which all these antient Heretikes did, to whom we may annexe all the Authours of heresies concerning the *Blessed Trinitie*, the knowledge whereof being reuealed and deliuered

1. Ioh. 4.

vnto vs to direct vs in this great mysterie of the *Incarnation*, the errours against *that* must needes reflect vpon *this*, and be of the same nature and importance, and consequētly of the same necessitie, by reason this mysterie of the *Incarnation* cannot stand vnlesse the mysterie of the Trinitie be likewoise true.

Nephew. I am fully satisfied in this poinct, but I pray tell me, good vncle, is not

§. 4.

The beliefe of the Hierarchie established by Christ in his church likewise of necessitie.

FOr what auaileth it mankinde that there be such easie meanes to come to heauen, if out of weaknesse, waywardenesse

wardneſſe, or careleſſeneſſe they will not looke after it? Suerly I cannot ſee but t'is only to the increaſe of their damnation. Like vnto an ambitious man who whileſt he is yet a farr of from the honnour which he aſpire's vnto, he can beare it patiently, but if once he come to a faire poſſibilitie, and haue it as it were in his hand, ô! Then if he miſſe it, he is incapable of all comfort and conſolation, and thinke's him ſelfe the moſt vnhappy and vnfortunate man in the word. So I conceiue that when a ſoule is out of hir bodie and come's to ſee how eaſily she might haue attained to that eternall Bliſſe and Happineſſe, where vnto she was ordained, and that

through hir owne neglect and careleſſeneſſe ſhe is now to be euerlaſtingly depriued thereof, ô God! Vncle, how infinitely will ſhe be greeued! how ſhe will curſe hir ſelfe! and thereby increaſe hir paine and miſerie.

Vncle. You ſaie well, cozen. Can you doubt therefore, or can a Chriſtian thinke, but 'tis a pointe of great neceſſitie to man Kynde, *If* there be anie order eſtablished by Chriſt Ieſus in his church to make men embrace, accepte, and purſue thoſe facile meanes to ſaluation, that they know and beliue it? Can a man of common ſenſe and iudgment imagine that this is not a pointe of maine importance? Or that who diſagree's about

this position doth only disagree in matter of opinion, wherein each one may hold what he pleaseth, and not in a matter substantially and fundamently necessarie to saluation.

Nephew. I confesse, Vncle, when I cõsidere the frailtie of man, and see how easily and ordinarily he is withdrawne from *willing* and *following* the meanes of his beatitude by the least terrestriall, sensuall, and momẽtarie pleasure, it where madnesse in me to believe that *supposing* there be anie such *order* established by Christ in his church to incite and prouoke men to accepte and practize these *saving* meanes, it were, I saie, madnesse not to thinke the

knowledge and beliefe of such an *order* to be one of the most important and necessarie pointes of christian doctrine.

Vncle. Remember then, cozen, the three stepps or degrees we talked of before, of knowing, esteeming, and pursuing anie *good*. And you will finde that, for the *first* it is necessarie the truth of Christian doctrine be conserued and often inculcated in to the harts and mindes of Christians, for the *second* that those who are to doe *this*, haue such qualities as wil giue them credit and make men beleiue them, and for the *third* that there be meanes taken (so farr as human nature giueth leaue) to cutt of all such impe-

diments as hinder men from preferring eternall good before the temporall teptations and sensuall pleasures of this life. The *first* of these conditions requireth that there be men appointed to haue care of the people by instructing and often putting them in minde of Christian doctrine. Which if Christ haue done, t'is euidēt that whosoeuer seeketh to change his *order* and *appointment* doth not quarell vpon a slight pointe, but vpon a most waighty and necessarie one.

Nephew. I see well that who seeketh to distroye such an *order* eltablished by Christ, playe's with his church as Esope's wolues played with the sheepe, offering them prey

vpon condition they would deliuer vp their doggs vnto them, which being done, they slew and preyed vpon the sheepe. And me thinke's, common sense telleth me there cannot be a pointe in all Christiã doctrine of greatter importance then this. For when I considere why treason is the greatteſt offence that can be committed in a common wealth, I see t'is because no law can subsiste and hold without guardes and lookers to it, so that who striketh at theſe guardes in a common wealth (of what nature so euer it be) striketh at the verie essentiall forme of it, at all the lawes, and at all what so euer doth conserue the peace and libertie of the whole peo-

ple and multitude, where vpō the common wealth doth subsiste. Wherefore t'is evident by naturall reason that who seeketh to remoue and abolish those whom God hath placed to guarde his church, striketh at the totall ruine thereof.

Vncle. T'is true, and therefore you maie inferre that questiōs of the Pope's authoritie ouer Bishopps, of Bishopps authoritie ouer Priests, and of Priests authoritie ouer the laictie are of no smale moment. And that who goe's about to distroye this Hierarchie aymeth at no lesse then the vtter ouerthrow of Religion and ruine of the church planted by Christ Iesus with so much sweate and blood,

and espoused so dearely vnto him with his sacred promises. These are the *Angells* to whō God hath trusted and committed the *charge of his flocke*. These are *they* by whose continuall succession we convince the perpetuitie of the Catholike church. These are the *men* who when anie new *Blasphemie* arriseth *meete in Counsells to give testimonie to the doctrine of Christ e re dwelling in the hearts of the faithfull*, and thereby *crush the serpent's head*. These are *they* who in their wisdomes, may and ought enacte lawes and Canons to Christ's flocke, and correct abuses creeping in both in discipline and moralitie, leauing still vntouched Christ's sacred institutions,

And therefore who seeketh to extirpate or infringe this authoritie in the church, setteth his axe at the roote of *faith* and *vertue*, by which the church of Christ doth subsiste. Nay euen in schismaticall churches the wiser and more learned sort of men haue euer detested and abhorred the confused Anarchie of brainesicke Puritants. And t'is said that wise state's men doe vehemently suspect, and haue iust cause to suppresse all Anty-Hierarchists.

Nephew. Certainely no prudent and moderate man can doubt of the importance of this pointe. And me thinke's, vncle, these zealous *societies* doe to the mainteners of this Hierarchie as Diogenes did

to Plato, scorning his vanitie with a farr greater pride, for whileſt they crye out againſt the pride of thoſe who ſeeke theſe dignities eſtabliſhed by Chriſt in his church, they diſcouera farr greater pride in them ſelues by endeauoring to diſtroy ſo facted an *inſtitution*, that they them ſelues may vſurpe the power and place. But to the ſecond degree and condition of the *diuiſion* you made, doe you thinke

That the adminiſtration of the
§. 4. *ſacraments by the Hierarchie is of ſuch great neceſſitie?*

VNCLE. How ſaie you cozen, what power, preeminencie, and qualities doe you thinke are neceſſarie for

these guardes and teachers of Christ's law and doctrine, to the end that the people may conceite such things as they tell them, and thinke them to be of moment? for surely the most part of men haue neede of all the helpes that may be, to eleuate and raise their mindes to celestiall cogitations?

Nephew. I see well enough that such men must needes haue credit with the people, and ought not only to be accounted wise and good men, but should be also esteemed wiser and better then the laietie, for I haue heard the Prophet's curse cited, *sicut populus sic & Sacerdos.* But this me thinke's should not touch vpon anie necessarie pointe of faith, seeing it depende's on

their particular liues and imployments, which are knowne by sense and experience, and not by anie tradition from our forefathers.

Vncle. You are mistaken, cozen, for although it is true that the clergie's euill liues may disgrace the motiues of reuerence bestowed vpon thē by Christ Iesus, yet if their liues be but tollerable, Christ may haue giuen them such eminent power and dignitie as that they will not want that reuerence and respect which is fit and conformable to the function and profession whereunto he hath caled them. And certes not without necessitie, if we considere the credulitie and obedience which are required at the people's

hands. Credulitie, of things beyond and aboue nature, nay beyond all the fables (be it spoken with respect) that euer man inuented. Obedience of hazarding liues and fortunes, nay of entirely ruining themselues and their posteritie (in respect of this world) in such cases as these *instruct* shall tell them that the law of God commande's it and require's it. Wherefore as Kings and Magistrates finde by experience that Pompes and Ceremonies, and the reseruing of certaine actions and creations to themselues, doe breede in their subiects (yea and in strangers too) honour and respect, and therefore are verie carefull how they imparte and communi-

care them, still keeping to them selues alone some Regall priuileges and prerogatiues. So likewise Christ Iesus not vnmindefull of his Ministers, left them, and to them only, the churche's Pompes and solemnities, but specially the Sacraments, to giue them credit and authoritie thereby. To Bishops the giuing of the Holy Ghost or *Confirmation* (Which is a continuance of the Mission of the third person of the holy Trinitie in the first Christian Pentecoste) and therefore who slight's Confirmation slight's that Missiō) and the cōsecrating of Priests.

Why Priests are to be honored.

To Priests the rest of the Sacraments, except Baptisme, which by reason of the people's necessitie could not con-

uenicily be reserued to Priests only, whereof there were to be but few. But cheefely he gaue them charge of the *Blou. dilesse sacrifice of his owne bodie*, and the *power of remitting sinnes*, whereon is principally grounded and subsiste's the reuerence due vnto the church of God. The one being a priuilege beyond man's inuention, and such an one, as if all the learned clarkes that euer liued since the begining of the world, should haue studied to raise, aduance, and magnifie some one estate of men to the highest pitch of *Reuerence* and *Eminencie* that could be imagined, they could neuer (without speciall light frō heauē) haue thought of anie thing comparable to this. And yet

so adapted to the secrets of nature, that who should diue in to hir mysteries would streight at the first proposing of it acknowledge it to be true, because a thing so hidden in the depth of nature's bowels could not be inuented and applyed in this manner by anie but the Maister of nature it self. The other being so mightie a power ouer man's nature and so extremely vsefull to mankinde, for their helpe and direction to eternall Blisse, that nether in respect of the awe which it strike's in to their subiects, nor in respect of the profit, which (being conueniently vsed) resulteth from it, there is nothing in this world anie waye estimable in comparison thereof. What

thinke you then, cozen, who seeketh to take awaye the reall presence of Christ's bodie in the *B: Sacrament*, and the power of *absolving sinnes*, doth he quarell vpon trifles? Be not these pointes (which we hold as true and as certaine, and vpon the same groundes, as we doe the *Trinitie* and *Incarnation*) of maine consequence and importance? And doth not he shake the fundamentall Basis, and cheefe cornerstone of the churches building who takes awaye this power and authoritie frō his *iudges* and *ministers*, whereby they were so reuerenced and honnored as that they were beleeued and obeyed? And finally be these questiōs to be left indifferent to euerie

idle braine and priuate phan-
sie to thinke and practize
what he please's?

Nephew. I must needes
confesse I neuer considered
thus much before, for truly I
see that the Administration of
the Sacraments are necessarie
for this end, thoe I haue heard
the Sacraments are necessarie
for manie other ends. But
now I easily conceiue that if
the clergie be not of credit, it
cannot haue the effect which
it was made and ordained for,
and if it hath not it's effect it
causeth not the keeping of
Christ's law, and if Christ's
law be not kept, there is no sal-
uation. So that's euident the
Clergie needeth the greatest
proppes and meanes of *credit*
and *reuerence* that can be had.

And surely what common wealth soeuer highly esteeme's of God's law and Christian doctrine, would wish the Clergie these verie qualities, if they had them not allreadie. Wherefore I wonder not that the Puritans, who mainely oppose Ecclesiasticall Hierarchie, doe so hate and detest the doctrine of the B. Sacrament, because they thinke all *Popery* is built vpō that great sacrifice. And I remember when I was in France, I perceiued that *going to Masse* was held the cheefe distinctiue signe and action betwixt a *Catholike* and a *Caluinist*. So that considering these supernaturall and neuersufficiētly honnored qualities of Priests, I eesily believe the storie which

is tould of S. Francis, that he said, if he should meete a *Priest* and an *Angell* he would first salute the Biest.

Uncle. You saie well, and surely were all Priest's liues such as did not partly disgrace theses guiftes bestowed vpon them, I doubt not but Kings would laye their crownes and sceptres at their feete, and weare their swords at their deuotion, which antiquitie telleth vs haith bene done and practized. Yea those Tribunall's and that temporall power and iurisdictiō (concerning which the clergie doth nowe perhaps too much contende with the laictie) were at the first forced vpō holy Bishops againſt their wills, either by particular men's pietie and

agreement, or by the Emperour's commands. The world then thinking him vnworthie to liue that would not condemne him selfe if the Bishop iudged against him, And both antiently in S. Hugh of Lincolne, and lately in S. Charles of Milan, the Christian world hath seene how great a power the *Reuerence* of a Bishop hath, euen in respect of Kings, when his life correspondes and seconde's his Dignitie.

Nephew. But I pray, vncle, doe you thinke that the greatest necessitie of the Sacraments doth consist in *this*, that by the reseruation of their administration to the clergie, the clergie's authoritie might be more exalted

and fitter to serue the church? I haue heard other reasons preferred before this, and therefore me thinke's you should more insist vpon that necessitie which in it self is the greatest and most forcible, then vpon a lesser.

Vncle. Why, cozen, I doe not intende to alledge all the reasons wherefore the Sacramẽts are necessarie, but only some forcible one, whereby it may follow that such questiõs as are betwixt Catholikes and Protestants concerning those pointes, may appeare to be of importance, and so fundamentall, as that Christian Religion cannot haue it's subsistãce and progresse without the knowlege of the truth in such questions and positions.

And certes if credit and authoritie be the only, or at least, the maine instrument and principall meanes whereby the preachers of Christianitie can presse and promote Christian doctrine, And that this credit and authoritie is incomparably more raised and strengthened by the Catholike *position* then by the Protestant's *negation*, it must needes follow that the efficacitie of Christian Preachers, and the strength of their cause is without comparison greather amongst Catholikes ten amongst Protestants, which doubtlesse cannot but moue anie reasonable man, who thinke's and believe's that our eternall good relye's and depēde's vpon Christian

doctrine. I know there be other neceſſities of the Sacraments. As for the vnitie of the church, which being diſperſed though the whole world could not be otherwiſe conſerued then by the practize of ſome externall actions common to them all, whereby they might know one the other. As alſoe for the augmentation of charitie and grace by the frequentation of them. But theſe pointes haue their proper treatiſes and places belonging vnto them. It ſuffiſeth I haue shewd you that there ought to be men appointed whoſe *care, function*, and *imployment* is to teach and conſerue in the people the truth of Chriſtian doctrine, and that for this effect

fect those men must needes haue some qualities aboue the ordinarie sort of men to authorise and giue credit to their documents. For although this doctrine of it's owne nature tende to the highest degree of perfection, and consequetly deserue's of it self to be infinitely esteemed and honnored, yet being supernaturall, that is farre aboue the innate capacitie and reach of man, the preachers and teachers thereof must of necessitie be endowed with extraordinarie power and authoritie to giue credit thereunto. Which supposed we may procede farther, to the *third degree and condition* of remouing impediments hindering the prosecution of our eternall good, and

first enquire whether

§. 6. *The resolutions of Generall Councells be sufficient to decide controuersies of faith, both in pointes of necessitie, and of indifferencie.*

TEll me then, cozen, is it thinke you lawfull for a priuate man to whose care the church is not committed, to doubt in himselfe, and breede doubtes in others, touching such pointes as these pastors of Christ's flocke (who by their function and profession haue the churche's gouernmẽt committed vnto them) are agreed vpon, and teach with common cõsent to the whole church?

Nephew. First I see, vncle,

that such a man shall not eas-
ily induce men to believe
him against so great an op-
position: and that therefore
he had needs of better grounds
in such pointes then in
others. Secondly I see that no
wise man will oppose the opi-
nion of so many authorized
experts, or held for experts,
and that in a matter of their
profession, without farre
greater and more pregnant
reasons in this particular busi-
nes then would be necessarie
in an other, wherein he had
not such maine prudentiall
motives against him. But
whether there be any obligati-
on in conscience, or whether
this be a matter of such im-
portance as to make a funda-
mentall pointe of Religion of

it, that I know not. For contrariwise me thinke's there should be also an obligation in conscience, when a man finde's that these gouernors are mistaken, that he should oppose them to the vtmost of his power.

Vera. You doe not fully conceiue my question, which is this, whether because these men haue the charge and care to teach God's law in the church (setting aside all other difficulties) there be an obligation in reason vpon this proofe grounds, not easily to oppose their determinatiō without being certaine and secure of verie good footing: not to attempt anie thing against their verdict without euident

pose is their iudgment if it be
ar fee to oppose them after
as before.

Nephew. As for obligation
I could you vncle, I know not
of anie; but this I see, com-
mon sense and naturall reason
teacheth vs, that such as haue
the charge ad care of instruc-
ting others, are supposed to
haue more vnderstanding in
the doctrine which they teach,
the those who learne of them.
And therefore if anie disputs
or controuersies arrise in such
matters, it seeth that these
teachers should be the iud-
ges thereof then those who
learne. And in a matter of skill
to appeale from them, when
a great and vniuersall part of
the wisest haue giuen their co-
senting iudgment to the matter.

is as absurde as to appeale fro Maisters to schollers, or from men of one profession to men of an other.

Vncle. Why this is all I aske, for where one part is absurde in reason, the other must needes be certaine by the same reason. And what is absurde in practise, is certaine that ought to be auoided. Wherefore if I mistake not, your discourse concludes, that whersoeuer the question is of skill, there no man ought to appeale from them who haue charge and care to teach, to those who learne in matters of that art. And therefore if those who haue the charge and care to teach Christian doctrine doe constantly and generally agree in anie point

after they haue heard and cõsidered the oppositions made against them, neither ought anie man appeale vnto the laietie, nor can the laietie without presumption and rashnesse accept of his appeale: not make themselues iudges in a businesse of other men's profession, wherein themselues are ignorant, or at the most, scholers. Now therefore sithence in our case there is no meanes for anie man to preuaile against the Clergie (whom we suppose agreed amongst themselues in anie pointe or position) but by making the laictie iudges thereof, it is euident that it wilbe still against reason for anie man to attempt the innouating of anie new pointe or position against the Clergies

common verdict, and generall consent, And consequently an obligation of reason and conscience not to doe it. Hence it follows that there is a power and authoritie in the Clergie of determining and deciding questions of Christian doctrine (whereof they are the teachers) and a necessitie in the laitie (who are their scholars) of obeying and quieting themselues. For the nature of sedition and factiō is nothing else, but to remoue the question from them who truly haue, or by their places are supposed to haue skill, to them who haue, or may be presumed to haue none, that is from the *Gouernors* to the *subiects*, from the *skillfull* to the *ignorant*, and from *natiues*, to

What is sedition.

Aliens. Secondly it follow's, that there can be but two cases only in which one may oppose there determinations and decisions. For 't is manifest that nothing but *evidence* of the truth can in the ame innovation of this kinde, because where there is no evidence the case ought to be putt to judgment and supreme judgment being already knowne and given (as in our case) there is no farther place for judgment, and therefore only *evidence* can be heard. Now this *evidence* either is so great as that there needes no skill to conceive and vnderstand it, and then the lattie may be admitted as Iudges. Or else the *Eminence* of the *Intruder* is such, as that a pointe may be

Nothing but evidence is a lawfull Warrant to oppose iudgment.

euident to him, and yet not to the greatest part of the Clergie, who are the naturall iudges of this cause. Wherefore euerie *Innouator* must of necessitie pretende one of these two. The first he cannot without charging the whole Clergie of peruerse and will full opposition and contradiction of the knowne truth, and so plainely knowne, that euerie man sees it at the first opening and proposing of it. Which whether it was euer done, or is possible to be done, I leave it to the iudgmēt of anie indifferent man. The second cannot anie waie belong to the ignorant and vnskillfull people. And therefore the *Innouator* must in such a case seeke out the most learned of

the Clergie, and to them propose his reasons, but must not in ame case publish his science to the vulgar ignorant (whom we suppose vncapable of it) for feare of sedition and faction. And in this case, as perhapps this point of doctrine may be necessarie, or at least conuenient for the higher orders of the Clergie, so likewise it cannot be necessarie for the vulgar people, sithence we suppose them incapable of it. And therefore this *minister introduces* must neuer make it common to the laietie, much lesse appeale from the Clergie to them. And thus you see that all controuersies in Religion must in be remitted to the iudgment of the Clergie, that is in Catholike

is as absurde as to appeale frō Maisters to scholliers, or from men of one profession to men of an other.

Vncle. Why this is all I aske, for where one part is absurde in reason, the other must needes be certaine by the same reason, And what is absurde in practise, this is certaine that ought to be auoided. Wherefore if I mistake not, your discourse conclude's, that wherefoeuer the question is of skill, there no man ought to appeale from them who haue charge and care to teach, to those who learne in matters of that art. And therefore if those who haue the charge and care to teach Christian doctrine doe constantly and generally agree in anie point

after they haue heard and cõsidered the oppositions made against them, nether ought anie man appeale vnto the laietie, nor can the laietie without presumptiõ and rashnesse accepte of his appeale, nor make them selues iudges in a busines of other men's profession, wherein them selues are ignorant, or, at the most, schollers. Now therefore sithence in our case there is no meanes for anie man to preuaile against the Clergie (whom we suppose agreed amongst the selues in anie pointe or position) but by making the laietie iudges thereof, t'is euident that it wilbe still against reason for anie man to attempt the innouating of anie new pointe or position against the Clergies

common verdict, and generall consent, And consequently an obligation of reason and conscience not to doe it. Hence it follow's that there is a power and authoritie in the Clergie of determining and deciding questions of Christian doctrine (whereof they are the teachers) and a necessitie in the laietie (who are their schollers) of obeying and quieting themselues. For the nature of sedition and factiō is nothing else, but to remoue the question from them who truly haue, or by their places are supposed to haue skill, to them who haue, or may be presumed to haue, none, that is from the *Gouernors* to the *subiects*, from the *skillfull* to the *ignorant*, and from *natiues*, to

What is sedition.

Aliens. Secondly it follow's, that there can be but two cases only in which one may oppose these determinations and decisions. For t'is manifest that nothing but *euidēce* of the truth can iustifie ane innouation of this kinde, becauſe where there is no euidence the caſe ought to be putt to iudgment, and ſupreme iudgment being alreadie knowne and giuen (as in our caſe) there is no farther place for iudgment, and therefore only *euidence* can be heard. Now this *euidence* ether is ſo great as that there neede's no skill to conceiue and vnderſtand it, and then the laitie may be admitted as iudges. Or elſe the *Emminence* of the *Introducer* is ſuch, as that a pointe may be

Nothing but euidēce is a lawfull Warrāt to oppoſe iudgmint.

euident to him, and yet not to the greateſt part of the Clergie, who are the naturall iudges of this cauſe. Wherefore euerie *Innouator* muſt of neceſſitie pretende one of theſe two. The firſt he cannot without charging the whole Clergie of peruerſe and willfull oppoſition and contradiction of the knowne truth; and ſo plainely knowne, that euerie man ſee's it at the firſt opening and propoſing of it. Which whether it was euer done, or is poſſible to be done, I leaue it to the iudgmẽt of anie indifferent man. The ſecond cannot anie waie belong to the ignorant and vnskillfull people. And therefore the *Innouator* muſt in ſuch a caſe ſ. cke out the moſt learned of

the Clergie, and to them propose his reasons, but must not in anie case publish his science to the vulgar ignorant (whom we suppose vncapable of it) for feare of sedition and faction. And in this case, as perhapps this poinre of doctrine may be necessarie, or at least conuenient for the higher orders of the Clergie, so likewise it cannot be necessarie for the vulgar people, sithence we suppose them incapable of it. And therefore this *minist introducer* must neuer make it common to the laietie, much lesse appeale from the Clergie to them. And thus you see that all controuersies in Religion must in be remitted to the iudgment of the Clergie, that is in Catholike

language to an *œcumenicall Councell.*

Nephew. Me thinke's, vncle, I could obiect one thing aga-inst your discourse, to witt, that t'is not in man's libertie to thinke or iudge what he will of anie positiō, such an act being a naturall operation, and the-refore that no man ought to be forced to belieue this or that. And to saie the truth, what can I thinke whether the great Turke be a talle or low man; whether the number of the starrs be odd or euen? if my life laid on't, I could not thinke ether part.

Vncle. I, cozen, but if the great Turke's true statua were in westminster, and that for going thither you might know his height, or that the

true number of the ſtarrs were ſett downe in an Almanacke which you might buy for a groate, I believe if your life laid on't you would eaſily be reſolued to thinke the truth.

Nephew. Mary, that's true, but then I were not forced to thinke or iudge one part, but only to ſeeke out the truth, and ſo come naturally to thinke it.

Vncle. Why then likewiſe if the church commande you to thinke and believe *that*, which by ſeeking you may eaſily come to know, not she but you are to blame if you doe not believe what she commande's. And if her authoritie be greater then anie argument which can be brought to the contrarie, and greater

then the moſt part of the reaſons where vpõ you build all the beliefs which gouerne your life and actiõs, may you not ſecurely believe what she believe's? Or if you pleaſe doe but ſeeke out the motiues which make's the church hir ſelfe believe what she teacheth, and you will eaſily believe with hir. But if you will not attende to the meanes which would make you know and believe the truth, is it not fitting you should be forced to your owne good, as fooles and vitious men are to follow reaſon? Some men, you know, doe things by force which otherwiſe they would neuer doe. And as doggs abſtaine from good bitts for feare of beating, ſo paſſionate men

come now and then to reason for feare or punishment.

Nephew. It is true a passionat man doth neuer see reason, and yet thinke's all other men vnreasonable, his passiō euer making him judge amisse. And therefore truly I doe not see why men should not be punished for their passions, and so be forced to leaue thē.

Vncle. If that be so, cozen, you will finde that your argument hath a greater extent then you are aware of. For if you considere how few there be that are not caried awaie with passion, or interest, and how secretly these dispositiōs lye hidd in the mindes and actions, euen of the best men: And then looke into the nature of our soule, and see that

nothing but *euidence* can strō-gly moue and draw hir of it selfe, or by it's owne force, you will plainely perceiue that *all opinion* is generally grounded vpon passion and interest, and therefore according to your argument all false opinions should be corrected.

Neph. W. I thinke in deede there's a great difference betwixt disputing wildly to and fro with arguments on both sides, which most men vse, and taking knowne and agreed principles and proceeding vpon them to drawe forth a long threed of science, as me thinke's your manner is. For I conceiue that if this methode were strickely obserued, men would attaine to farre more knowledge in things neces-

sarie to our *well being*, and to a greater Eminence in profitable curiosities.

Vncle. How soeuer, cozen, I hope you now perceiue that this pointe hath resolued all controuersies. For if all disputs betwixt vs and others of a different communion be in matters subiect to iudgment, and that there cã be no higher iudgment vpon earth, for the resolution of such difficulties, then of a Generall Councell, And that we doe not refuse communion to anie man but for matters thus resolued, it euidently followe's that all questions betwixt vs and what church soeuer of different communion are alreadie past iudgment, and consequently past dispute. For what opi-

nion, I pray, can you haue of those, who will not admitte, nor be content with anie iudgment which God hath left vpon earth for such matters as they themselues call in doubt: I thinke both common sense and naturall reason will condemne them. But lett me aske you one question farther. Suppose that something be ordered in the church of God according to the iudgment and discretion of *those*, to whom God hath giuen the power of *Gouernment* and *iudgment* in such matters, which perhapps of it selfe might be otherwise ordered with out anie preiudice to the church, but *they* thought this waie the fittest; now come's others, to whom this charge is not committed,

and saie t'is ordered amisse, requiring it may be altered, whether doe you thinke that in this case, this *order* ought to be changed vpon their demande and proposition?

Nephew. If those controwlers can shew an error in the *order*, thē me thinke's it were fitting to change it, but if not, then I should absolutly condemne them of disobedience and schisme, if they should persevere to stand out, And he that should excuse them, were to be suspected as not true to anie authoritie though he professe to acknowledge it.

Uncle. Softly, cozen, softly there's nothing more frequēt amongst men then through passion and oversight to forsake their owne principles,

and contradict in one matter what them selues confesse in an other. And therefore although it be true by cõsequẽce of reason, that who soeuer doth rise against the church in this kinde, may vpõ the same grounde and principle be false to anie other authoritie or gouerment, yet vpon other reasons, or by not seeing the consequence of his fact, he may likewise be true and faithfull. And therefore it were rashnesse to condemne, for this reason alone, those truths, which such an one may perhapps mantaine in other matters. Howsoeuer is not our cõclusion manifest, that there is no place for *Ifs* and *Ands* in our case, where there can be no euidence brought against

a pointe of doctrine, which the higheſt *Tribunall* and *Iudgement* vpon earth hath alreadie decreed? But ſuppoſe ſome one or few of theſe innouators had *Euidence* on their ſide, yet the vulgar people, whom they putt on to mutinie, cannot haue it, no nor anie certaintie that theſe their ring leaders haue *Euidence*, being not able to compare vnderſtandingly the worth of diuers men in a buſines which ſurpaſſeth their capacitie, And therefore this common people, in ſuch a caſe, muſt needs proceede and doe, what ſoeuer they doe, vpon paſſiō, ſurpriſe, or intereſt, And conſequently thoſe *innouators* who moued, caried, and preſſed them thereunto, cannot

be excused from being culpable of temeritie, obstinacie, and Archi-Rebellion. Yet as a Prince doth some times condescende to his Rebellious subiects, that he may gaine time, and so bring them to reason, as Roboam's wiser Councell thought fitt to giue eare to the cryes of the communities for once, that they might serue him euer after: So I doubt not but the church both may and will relent some times a litle to establish hir Gouerment and good order more strongly an other time. Nor is she to be reprehended if contrariewise she be rigorous vpō occasions, to witt, when she see's that relenting weaken's hir authoritie, and doth rather increase then assuage the mu-

time. But what is now and then conuenient to be done, that belong's to them who are in place to iudge. And for vs to obey, and I'll suppose they doe the best.

Nephew. Hitherto, vncle, me thinke's I am well satisfied, but there's a maine difficultie about the diuersitie of the *rule of faith*. I pray, tell mee, doe you not thinke

That the maintenance of the vnitie of the church is of extreme great necessitie? §. 7.

FOr we professe, you know, that tradition, or the receite of our doctrine from father to sonne, is our cheefe authoritie, and our prime motiue of faith, All others will

acknowledge no other rule then their owne interpretatiō of the scripture. This in my minde is the most important question of all the controuersies in Religion, and vpon the resolution of this pointe doth rely and depende all other disputs and difficulties of christian faith, nay euē our being truly and properly Christians or faithfull. For if Christ was a lawmaker, not euerie one who professeth his name, but who obserueth his law is truly a Christian. And if Christ haue sett downe a certaine *rule* or *manner*, and certaine *Magistrats*, by whom we are to know this law, whosoeuer doth not follow that *rule* and acknowledge those *Magistrats* cannot be said to obserue

What it is to be a Christian.

obserue his law, and consequētly professe Christ's name wrongfully.

Vncle. Doe you thinke, cozen, that who doth not obserue Christ's law is no Christian? what then shall become of sinners? shall none of them be Christiās, nor of the church of Christ? you will make a church of only *Elects* or *Predestinates*, as the Puritants doe.

Nephew. It may be I goe to farr, yet certainely who doth not keepe Christ's law, or professe to keepe it, is no Christian. But then me thinke's I goe to farr on the other side, for all those that professe Christ's name, doe likewise professe to keepe his law, how litle soeuer they doe.

Vncle. Why then cozen, I will helpe you out, and open the ſtate of the queſtion vnto you. *Firſt* you muſt know that this word *Eccleſia* in it's primitiue ſenſe ſignifieth a meeting or cõgregatiõ of mẽ called out of a greater multitude, as a Councell or Senate is. And becaus the firſt Chriſtiãs were called in that manner by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, *Ego vos elegi de mundo*, therefore we properly and deſeruedly call the multitude of Chriſtiãs a *Church*. Now a multitude *called to gether*, is not only and ſimply a multitude, (which may importe confuſion) but a multitude gathered together and vnited. If you aske wherein this multitude, we ſpeake of, is vnited, t'is

What is a church.

Ioh. 15.

wherein conſiſt's the vnitie of the church.

knowne that t'is to doe the will of the caller, who being *Iesus*, (that is, *saviour* or *Director* to saluation) their calling must be to walke the paths of saluatiõ, And sithence we haue no other Maister of our saluation but *Iesu Christ*, t'is euident that the vnitie of his church must consiste in the obseruance of his law. *Secondly* you are to note, that there are two sortes of vnities, the one of similitude, the other of connection. We saie, all men are of one nature, that's an vnitie of similitude, we saie likewise, all the parts of a man (though dislike in themselues) make one man, there's an vnitie of connectiõ. Now if the church of Christ had beene to continue only

for his owne, or his Apostle's time, the former vnitie would haue serued. Nay euen now, if all the Christians, who liue at this day, *doe*, and *performe* the same things, practize the same faith and good life, and vse the same Sacraments, This *vnitie* of similitude would suffice to make the church of Christ *one* for the present, but could not make it subsiste and continue, there being no connection amongst the parts and members of this multitude to make them sticke together. Wherefore Christ hauing planted a multitude of faithfull which he intended should subsiste and continue for manie ages, no doubt but he hath giuen them such an *vnitie* as is necessarie for cõti-

nuance. *Thirdly* therefore you must note that there are two sortes of multitudes in this world which subsiste and continue, the one naturall, as the parts of a liuing creature, the other morall as the members of communities or commonwealths, and both haue their proportionall vnities. For the first we see that in plantes all the members haue a due connection to the roote, from which being cutt of the part dyeth for want of continuitie. In other liuing creatures we likewise finde at hart (or some thing else that supplie's it's function) by connectiō wherevnto eu erie part receiueth life and subsistence, and whose passage or communication with that hart be-

ing ſtopped and cutt off, the part by litle and litle fade's and dye's. For the ſecond ſubſiſting and cõtinuing multitude, we ſee in all communities or common wealths there is a *head, common Councell*, or *higheſt authoritie*, whereynto all the members repaire in neceſſitie, and by their connection therewith, they receiue *ſecuritie, life*, and *motion* in that morall kinde of being, euerie man doing his dutie according to the lawes of that communitie, and the *head* or *ſupreme authoritie* prouiding for the obſeruance of the lawes in generall, and particularly for the direction of ſuch cates as the lawes reach not vnto. So that if you take awaie this *head* or *coumon wiſdome*, the multi-

tude must of neceſſitie be short liued, and quickly come to ruine. Hence it is euident to common ſenſe and naturall reaſon, that the church of Chriſt being a multitude ordained to ſubſiſte and continew, muſt not only haue the *vnitie of ſimilitude* and be *one* by the ſimilitude of actions which Chriſt hath preſcribed, and all Chriſtians practize; but alſo by the vnitie of connection to ſome common *head* and *ſupreme Councell*, whereby it may conſerue it ſelfe, and keepe it's ſubiects in the continuance of the law of Chriſt, and in the practize of thoſe actions which he hath commanded. And here you may note, that were this law naturall, there needed no

Vncle. Why then cozen, I will helpe you out, and open the state of the question vnto you. *First* you must know that this word *Ecclesia* in it's primitiue sense signifieth a meeting or cõgregatiõ of men called out of a greater multitude, as a Councell or Senate is. And becaus the first Christiãs were called in that manner by Christ and his Apostles, *Ego vos elegi de mundo*, therefore we properly and desetuedly call the multitude of Christiãs a *Church*. Now a multitude *called to gether*, is not only and simply a multitude, (which may importe confusion) but a multitude gathered together and vnited. If you aske wherein this multitude, we speake of, is vnited; it is

What is a church.

Ioh. 15.

Wherein consist's the vnitie of the church.

knowne that t'is to doe the will of the caller, who being *Iesus* (that is, *Sauiour* or *Director* to saluation) their calling must be to walke the paths of saluatiõ. And sithence we haue no other Maister of our saluation but *Iesu Christ*, t'is euident that the vnitie of his church must consiste in the obseruance of his law. *Secondly* you are to note, that there are two sortes of vnities, the one of similitude, the other of connection. We saie, all men are of one nature, that's an vnitie of similitude, we saie likewise, all the parts of a man (though dislike in themselues) make one man, there's an vnitie of connectiõ. Now if the church of Christ had beene to continue only

for his owne, or his Apostles time, the former vnitie would haue serued. Nay euen now, if all the Christians, who liue at this day, *doe*, and *performe* the same things, practize the same faith and good life, and vse the same Sacraments, This *vnitie* of similitude would suffice to make the church of Christ *one* for the present, but could not make it subsiste and continue, there being no connection amongst the parts and members of this multitude to make them sticke together. Wherefore Christ hauing planted a multitude of faithfull which he intended should subsiste and continue for manie ages, no doubt but he hath giuen them such an *vnitie* as is necessarie for con-

nuance. Thirdly therefore you must note that there are two sortes of multitudes in this world which subsiste and continue, the one naturall, as the parts of a liuing creature, the other morall as the members of communities or common wealths, and both haue their proportionall vnities. For the first we see that in plantes all the members haue a due connection to the roote, from which being cute of the part dyeth for want of continuitie. In other liuing creatures we likewise finde an hart (or some thing else that supplies it's function) by connectio whereunto euerie part receiueth life and subsistence, and whose passage or communication with that hart be-

ing stopped and cutt off, the part by litle and litle fade's and dye's. For the second subsisting and cõtinuing multitude, we see in all communities or common wealths there is a *head, common Councell*, or *highest authoritie*, whereunto all the members repaire in necessitie, and by their connection therewith, they receiue *securitie, life*, and *motion* in that morall kinde of being, euerie man doing his dutie according to the lawes of that communitie, and the *head* or *supreme authoritie* prouiding for the obseruance of the lawes in generall, and particularly for the direction of such cases as the lawes reach not vnto. So that if you take awaie this *head* or *coumon wisdome*, the multi-

tude must of neceſſitie be short liued, and quickly come to ruine. Hence it is euident to common ſenſe and naturall reaſon, that the church of Chriſt being a multitude ordained to ſubſiſte and continew, muſt not only haue the *vnitie of ſimilitude* and be *one* by the ſimilitude of actions which Chriſt hath preſcribed, and all Chriſtians practize, but alſo by the vnitie of connection to ſome common *head* and *ſupreme Councell*, whereby it may conſerue it ſelfe, and keepe it's ſubiects in the continuance of the law of Chriſt, and in the practize of thoſe actions which he hath commanded. And here you may note, that were this law naturall, there needed no

The want of the true rule of faith excludes from the church.

more to be of the church then to be a member of this communitie, and he would be out of it, who should not participate of the two vnities. But our Christian law being aboue nature, and cõsequẽtly not to be learned by man's iudgmẽt, but by authoritie, (that is by receiuing it from Christ) those who doe not receiue it by that *meanes* and *rule* by which Christ hath ordained it shall be receiued, are not truly of this communitie, what soeuer be their materiall beliefe and opinion. Wherefore you are to considere farther, that this *Receipte* of Christ's law and doctrine may haue beene ordained by Christ himself to be effected two seuerall waies. First by word of mouth, that

is, that this law and doctrine should be vocally taught and deliuered from hand to hand, from father to sonne to the world's end: secondly, by writing. Now therefore if Christ haue ordained both these waies, who should not accept of them both, is not truly and properly a Christiã, nor consequently of the Christian communitie. If Christ haue only instituted *tradition* to be the meanes and rule of the *receite* of his law and doctrine, and hath giuen *scripture* only for superabundant instruction and consolation, then who should reiect *tradition*, and flye to the *scripture*, making it his only *rule* and *meanes* of *receiuing* Christ's law and doctrine, were not truly

and properly a Christian, nor of the Christian communitie. Lastly if Christ haue ordained *scripture alone* to be this *rule* and *meanes*, then who cleaueth to *Tradition* is not truly a Christian. The resolution of this question doth properly belong to the Gouernors of the church, who if they haue the true rule, their subiects are safe, if not, their subiects soules will be required at their hands by whom they perish. But I will take an other time to giue you a full resolution of this maine difficultie. In the interim you may inferre out of this discourse to our present purpose that *three things* are required to make one a legitimate Christian, and such an

Three thing s are required to make a legitimate Christia

one, as euerie Christian ought to bee, if he will be truly one of the communitie and church of Christ. Though perhapps one may be in some sorte a Christiã, and goe to heauen too, by an extraordinarie meanes, without having all these three subsequent dispositions and qualities. The first is, that he belieue and practize the law of God, which in respect of a particular man is but short, and t'is, in a word, to loue God aboue all things. The second is, that he be vnited to the multitude of true Christians, that is, that he depende of the Gouerment left and instituted by Christ here vpon earth. And for this pointe or qualitie, as I doubt not but some

one or few may be saued without it (yea peraduenture with an opposition to it in fact through ignorance, so his hart be true and without passion) yet to thinke this a common, ordinarie, and high waie to saluation, and that it is as indifferent to liue from vnder this Gouerment setled by Christ, as vnder it, were ridiculous and absurde in common sense and reason, and in deede it were to annullate Christ's coming, and make his law voide and fruitlesse. And if you desire to conceiue the necessitie of this pointe more fully, doe but reflect and considere the nature of all ciuill and politicall commonwealths, wherein if anie member doe not liue vnder the Gouernors,

and depende of the Magi-
strats eſtablished by the high-
eſt power and authoritie the-
reof, he cannot be truly and
properly ſaid to be a part and
member of that communitie,
nor can he aſſuredly know
(ordinarily ſpeaking) nor con-
ſtantly performe the law and
orders of it. The third pointe
is, that this communitie, whe-
reof euerie particular Chriſtiã
is to be a share and member,
hath the true *rule* and *meanes*
to know and obſerue the law
of Chriſt. And it is neceſſarie
that this pointe be more ex-
actly knowne by thoſe who
liue amongſt diuerſitie of
opinions in this matter. For
where there appeareth learned
and morally good mẽ taking
parts in this queſtion, a priuat

man seeme's to haue iust reaſō to doubt whether ſide he ſhall take for his guide, and therefore this pointe well dicuſſed amōgſt ſuch, giue's a man full and generall ſatisfaction for his whole beliefe and practize. And theſe two laſt pointes cleere one the other, for that communitie which hath the true meanes of the *receipte* of Chriſt's law and doctrine, that is, the *true rule of faith*, muſt of neceſſitie be it, of, and *in* which we are to ſeeke, and ſhall finde, Chriſt's law. And contrariewiſe if we finde the true communitie, we are ſure it hath the true *rule* of knowing Chriſt's law and doctrine. Hence it is that the Catholike church euer preſſed hir Aduerſaries with two ſpeciall ar-

guments; 1. with the *nouelties* of their church; shewing that none of them euer had a continuall visible succession: 2. that they receiue not their opinions from their Ancestors, and by them from Christ, but that they were inuented at such a time, against the receiued *tenet* of the church in that time, that is, traditiō for the church, and nouelty of doctrine in their Aduersaries. And now I thinke you see the resolution of our first question.

Nephew. I thinke I doe, and 'tis (if I be not deceaued) that such as professe to keepe the law of Christ (though in effect they doe not performe it) are to be accounted of the church, and consequently sinners are not to be excluded, so long as

they submitte themselues to the churche's Gouerment established by Christ: And on the other side, though diuers pretende to Christ's law and doctrine, yet vnlesse they be ioyned and vnited to that cõmunitie which hath *this gouerment*, and *the true rule* to know and continue Christ's law, they cannot (generaly speaking) be saued. But you said one thing which troubles me, to wit, that some be saued euen without these conditions, which is against our commõ saying, that there's no saluatiõ out of the church of God, and therefore, you know, we labour to gett people reconciled and vnited to the church euen in the hower of their death, which would not be so

How some may be saued out of the church.

needfull if saluation could be had out of the church.

Vncle. Why, cozen, doe you not saye, that euerie man hath two eggs, two eyes, and the like, though some particular men be destitute of both? we saye men cannot liue without meate, and yet some haue liued manie yeares without it. We saie men cannot liue in the water and yet t'is writt, that the Portugalls in their discouerie found a man whose habitation was in the sea, and came only to land as Crocodiles and seacalfes doe. So you see we putt vniuersall denominations vpon the common and generall, and that without preiudice to lawfull exceptions of rareties or prodigies. You know there's no

generall rule but hath an exception, and Logicians saie, *ars non curat de accidentibus fortuitis.*

Nephew. But I pray you shew me, why it is a rare accident for a man to be saued out of the church. For example, if we looke into the tenets of our Protestants, I see not why they may not be said to hold sufficient pointes of faith both to attaine to the loue of God, which is the cheefe path of saluation, but also to liue an ordinarie and competēt good life amongst their neighbours, which is the compleatnesse of God's law.

Vncle. Were not man a ciuill and social animall, that is, to liue with others, I should not denye, but a Protestant

might more ordinarily be saued. For as you said well, they hold as manie tenents with the Catholike church as be in some sorte sufficient for the direction of a priuate mā's life. But God hath cōmanded euerie mā to haue care of his neighbour, at least so farr, as not to hinder him from such things as be necessarie to his saluation. And manie things being necessarie to a multitude, which are not needefull to euerie particular and priuat person, he that hindre's the multitude from such necessarie meanes and assistance, can neuer be saued himself. As if some Prouince or part of a cōmonwealth should start vp and refuse diuers antient lawes necessarie for the good

and peaceable living of the
whole multitude, some prin-
men perhapps of this prouin-
ce might so live and behaue
them selues as to correspond
and comply with the end and
intention of the whole com-
mon wealth in vertue of some
such other lawes and statutes as
might be generally admitted
and commonly receiued by
them all, but sure it is, that the
multitude and communitie of
this prouince would neuer
reach to this perfection, wan-
ting (as we suppose) seuerall
lawes and institutions necessarie
for them in common and in
generall. Now that the Catho-
like's *tenents*, which the Protes-
tants refuse and contradict,
are of this nature, to witt, that
they are necessarie for the

multitude, t'is euident. As Gouernment of the whole church, and those lawes and Canons which these Gouernors vniuersally assembled doe ennact and ordaine for the good of the totall multitude, and in particular, praying for the deade, praying to Saincts, The vse of pictures, Sacraments, Ceremonies and the like, which Christ, or his Apostles, or their successors instituted for the benefit of the vniuersall communitie and multitude, Amongst whom there being diuers tasts, one is pleased with one thing, an other with something else. Wherefore the Protestants in contradicting these pointes, hinder the multitude of their saluatiō (supposing these things

be good and necessarily ordained, as we Catholikes suppose, and as I will shew you presently) and therefore we pronounce generally of all Protestants that they cannot be saued, though we doe not absolutly exclude euerie particular man, who through ignorance may (for anie thing I know) be excused from the guilt of Protestancie.

Nephew. I am hartily glad to heare you saie that soe many may be excused, for I shall haue better hopes of some of my deceased friends then heretofore I haue had. But since you are fallen into this discourse, I pray, let me vnderstand why the Protestants can assure vs of being vncharitable when we saye, they shall

damned vnlesse they be excused by ignorance? For sure they themselues must needes saie as much of vs, sithence they accuse vs of Idolatrie, and other hainous crimes, and consequently they must be as vncharitable as we, or else they will runne into a contradiction.

Knole. The mixture of Protestants and Puritants in one common wealth hath, and must of necessitie draw manie into errour, who cannot distinguish which be Protestants which be Puritants, nor whether's doctrine it is, that vrged. For this verie blaming of our vncharitablenesse (which I thinke is as old as Protestancie it selfe), sheweth that the true Protestants haue euer

beene of this opinion, that the disputes betwixt Catholikes and them, were but matters of indifferencie. I remember when I was a boy there dyed a vertuous Catholike Kinsman of myne, and at the same time dyed a morall honest Protestant, and the countrie said they were both gone to heauen, but the one by Rome the other by Geneua, and so the Papist hath the longer iourney. And the imputation which the people generally laid vpon Catholikes was, that they oppressed men with too great and vnneedfull burdens, and forced men to their opinions. And this cannot be otherwise according to the grounds of Protestants, for we know all that they haue

and

and more, and in particular we refuse nothing that can be proued by scripture, which is the maine principle of Protestanisme, being the only rule and fundation of their beliefe, and we damne, as well as they, who soeuer will not beliue what is euidēt in the scripture, only we sticke to what our forefathers haue taught vs, according to the principles of nature, common sense, and the examples of all the laws and common wealths of the world, vntill the contranie be cleered against vs. Wherefore Protestāts being strongly vrged must ether saie in their heate, that Catholikes can giue no probable or apparent answere to those places of the scripture which they bring

and alledge against them (which must needes be ether an ignorant or a madd man's speach) or else that such questions as are disputed betwixt them and vs are of indifferencie and not of necessitie. Wherefore I believe that those who saie that they ought, and may, censure vs as freely as we censure them, smell of *Puritanisme*, leaving the Protestants in the maine pointe. Nether is this to answere, but to acknowledge that want of charitie which true Protestants obiect against vs, and so condemne themselues. But we Catholikes censure Protestants, first, becaus they refuse *that*, which we hold to be the true rule of faith, to witt, the churche's authoritie or tradi-

Why Catholikes censure Protestants so hardly.

tion. And sithence the rule of faith runne's through the whole course of our beliefe, ād is the tennor and principle vpon which we hold euerie particular article, t'is euident that who doth not accepte of this right and true rule of attaining to the knowledge of Christian faith, cannot belieue aright, nor haue true faith but by chance, and therefore will misse it for the most part. Secondly this rule of ours tell's vs, that Protestant's negatiue positions are against the generall good of the multitude of Christians, that is, against charitie, and God's law, hindering them from diuers important and necessarie meanes conducing to saluation. Lastly it were meere folly to leaue

poſſeſſion vpon a ſlight argu-
ment. For as in *equalitie* the
better proofe, should carrie
the cauſe, the equall deuide it,
ſo where there is poſſeſſion
on the one ſide, there nothing
but ſuch conuiction as the na-
ture of the cauſe doth beare,
ought to waine poſſeſſion,
otherwiſe no human poſſeſ-
ſion would be ſtable and con-
ſtant. Now Catholikes are a
certaine of theſe two points
as that they liue and breath,
towitt, that they haue poſſeſ-
ſion, And that there's no evi-
dent conuiction hitherto pa-
ſed and shewed againſt them.
Wherefore I ſee not why a
Proteſtant should be offen-
ded that the Catholikes cen-
ſure all their Aduerſaries in
generall ſo ſeuerely, ſithence

t'is manifeſt, that if they should not doe ſo, they would not only betraye their owne principles, but alſo denye their breetheren that fraternall rebuke and admonition, which the law of God and good neighbourhood require's at the hands of men ſo perſuaded as theſe grounds force and oblige vs to be.

Nephew. Surely then this is the reaſon why the church now and then chaſticeth ſuch ſubiects as rebell in beliefe againſt hir, which the Proteſtants ſo exclame at.

Vncle. T'is ſo in deede, and being no other church can haue this principle againſt vs, if at anie time they perſecute vs for our faith and beliefe, they muſt needes doe it more

out of passion and reuenge, then out of anie rationall loue and knowing zeale to God and Religion. And now, cozen, I hope you conceiue the extreme necessitie and maine importance of these pointes which we haue talked of, being such as that the church of God cannot subsiste without them, and essentiall to Christ's coming, *it* *witt*, to establish *some* to haue the charge and care of teaching and gouerning his church, And that these teachers and Gouernors haue great credit and authoritie, euen supernaturall and more then human, And that their iudgment in matters of beliefe and Religion is to stand good, nor may be subiected to the

weake and wauering iudgmẽt of the laietie, that is of men ignorant in the principles of their ſcience and diſcipline: And laſtly that being thus vnited they haue the true and right *rule* of knowing Chriſt's law, and thoſe things which are to be belieued and practized. All which you ſee are of that nature, that the verie eſſence of a Chriſtian church and communitie cannot ſubſiſte and continue without anie of them all, And without ſuch a church the Generalitie of mankinde cannot be maintained in charitie, nor without charitie arriue to eternall Happineſſe, for which both charitie and all theſe other pointes are abſolutly neceſſarie. This hath beene the

chaine of our discourse hitherto, if you haue well vnderstood and conceiued my intention. Which likewise you see I haue done by the light of common sense and reason, according to my promis, And sithence you would haue me to goe this waye, and nether flye vp to sublime metaphysickes, nor drowne your memorie with tedious allegations of authors, we will still continue in the same path, insisting in the principles of nature, and shewing that diuers pointes of our faith and practise, which the Protestants deney, are, euen by their conformitie to naturall reason it self, ād by their owne proper force and efficacitie of causing and producing good and vertuous

effects in a Christian cõmunitie (and thereby contributing to saluation) are, I saie, of no smale consequence and importance. First therefore tell me, whether you thinke there be anie other necessitie in respect of the pointes controuerted betwixt vs and the Protestants, then this absolute and maine *one*, which we haue alreadie talked of? I meane whether there be not an other necessitie, which though not altogether so great in it self, and of it's owne nature, yet such an one, as is sufficient to make a pointe of importance, and of such importance, as that to reiecte it, would be a lawfull and iust cause to refuse and denye communion to the refractarie and obstinate

oppoſers thereof? And le ttvs put the queſtion thus.

§. 8. *Whether ſome pointes may not be of neceſſitie in a lower degree, as in particular the vſe of pictures or Images?*

NEphew. I told you before how I thought *neceſſitie* might be diſtinguished into an abſolute neceſſitie, and into a neceſſitie of a meanes for abtaining the thing we deſire with greater eaſe and cõueniencie, and you liked well of it. But me thinke's it were a hard caſe to depriue anie man of that meanes and qualitie, without which he can not abſolutly attaine to his end, that others may come to their ends with greater eaſe and ſecuritie. And therefore I should thinke that no other

necessitie but an absolute one, were sufficient to deserue excommunication, which I take to be a depriuing of a partie from *that*, without which he cannot obtaine eternall Blisse.

Vncle. Why, cozen, lett vs suppose that in a communitie of one hundreth thousand, nyntie thousand would neuer attaine to Blisse (though absolutly they could) vnlesse the waye were made easie, doe you thinke it were fitt or tollerable in anie one, or in a douzen, to take awaie the meanes whereby the waye were facilitated to the rest? Nay suppose ten thousand of the hundreth thousand would arriue to happinesse with great paines and labours, were it not better in the Gouernor's eye, who

ought to be a common father to them all, to lett the thenth part perish, then all the other nine?

Nephew. I confesse I see myne ouersight, for truly the church is bound in such a case to proceede with rigor, And the partie which will not condescende to helpe the frailtie of their breetheren, doth by this very fact deserue to loose the protection of charitie, which it willfully abandon's, And in effect such a partie hath alreadie putt it selfe out of the secret communitie of God's church, and the Gouernor is only to performe it in externall apparence.

Vncle. Add to this, cozen, that such a partie doth willfully stand out in this manner

vpon pride and faction to iuſtifie their opinion, And that they trench vpon the Gouermēt ordained by Ieſus Chriſt, them ſelues not being caled therevnto, proudly ſetting themſelues in the ſeate of iudgment to determine what's fitt and conuenient for the whole Chriſtian communitie, and ſtrugling to force their opinions vpon the church againſt the ſentence of the churche's Gouernors, which ſurely ought to preuaille in ſuch a caſe. Looke but into the exemples of anie pollitcall common wealth, and ſee what inequalitie there is betvixt twelue pence and a man's life, and yet our laws ordaine the loſſe of life for the ſtealth of a shilling or there abouts,

not considering the valew of the thing stollen, but that such a fact is the breach of publicke iustice in the common wealth, which if it were permitted no mã should be Maister of his owne. This then being suppo-sed, I doubt not but you will grant likewise that in a church, *vertue* is to be engendred and conserued with great care and diligence, And although the same things which first breede pietie and deuotion doe afterwards conserue it, yet may there be some things more proper for the conser-uation then for the breeding of it, and contrariewise others more proper for breeding then conseruing it, according as the different state of anie thing that growe's towards

perfection doth require a diuers care and attendance. Tell me then, cozen, how thinke you is the breeding of *vertue* performed in man kinde? I meane not the first breeding, which is donne by instruction, but the flourishing increase of it, and the bringing of it to strength? *How vertue is bredde in man.*

Nephew. Sithence vertue is nothing but the loue of what is truly good for man, and that we cannot loue what we know not, *vertue* must needes be cheefly increased by cleerely seeing and often thinking of the *thing* we ought to loue, and of such things as belong vnto it, and make it appeare worthie of loue, Amongst which one is, that it be in our power to obtaine it. Where

vpon I see that the breeding of vertue consisteth in three things, *often thinking of it's object, highly esteeming of it,* and *conceiting it to be possible.* Which correspondes to the three stepps and degrees, you made, of tēding to anie good. And if these three things be well obserued and performed by anie societie of men, *vertue* must of necessitie increase and florish in that communitie.

Vncle. I am glad you profit so well, and make such good vse of what I saie, If now therefore, cozen, the disputs and differences which are in particular positions betwixt vs and Protestants, doe concerne all these three pointes, and that highly, will you not confesse that they are of great im-

portance? For the first you haue heard I am sure how God Allmightie in the old law would haue men's harts perpetually busied about his law, how he would haue them to thinke of it at home and vpon the high waie, morning and euening, how he would haue his comandments bound to their hands, and so euer wagging before their eyes, and written vpon the frontispice of their houses. All which was to signifie that the memorie of God's law could not be too great, being not sufficient to thinke of it in the church only, or at vacant times from necessarie labours, but that our thoughts ought euer to be imployed that waye. The like doth the Catholike church,

causing to be erected vpon the highwaies, in market-places, and in corners of streetes some times crosses with our sauiour's image nailed vpon them, some times his flagellation, his coronation, his resurrection, his ascention or some other mysterie of our redēption, or pious representation, to putt vs in minde of what ought to moue vs to the loue of God, which are frequently to be seene in Catholike countries in euerie house, in euerie roome, ouer euerie dore, whereof there be yet some markes in our owne Countrie. And can you thinke that this diligence of our forefathers compared to those commāds of God Allmightie in the old law, to be ouer much? Or that

the zeale of thoſe who pulled downe theſe memories of Chriſtianitie was according to ſcience? Doth not the queſtiō of this pointe cleerely concerne the increaſe of vertue, and the churches Gouerment? Surely it doth. For I thinke no wiſe and indifferent man can doubt but that pictures muſt needes breede manie good thoughts which would neuer haue beene without them. What true Chriſtian can looke vpon the repreſentation of anie bloodie paſſage of our ſauiour's paſſion, but he will be moued to ſome good thought or ſentiment if he haue anie feeling of Chriſtianitie in him? Or if ſome be not moued to pious thoughts by ſuch an obiect, will not manie

others be? And none can doubt but that from such deuout thoughts doe naturally proceede and floe manie vertuous affections, and these affections doe engender perfection, it being their connaturall leauings and effect, And this perfection is *that* which saueth our soules. So that you see some come to saluation, others to a higher degree of perfection, and cõsequently of Blisse, by the vse of pictures. Where by the waye you may note that if pictures haue this effect in our soules, to what degree of reuerence and affection will not the blessed Sacrement it selfe raise them who truly and assuredly belieue Christ's reall, corporall, and substantiall presence to be cõ-

tinually in their churches and vpon their Altars? And what a motife of loue doe *they* take from the church, who refuse and denye this pointe.

Nephew. You speake with reason and common sense in my iudgment. And in deede the price of *one* soule is more worth then anie temporall good, euen of state, nay euen of the whole world, which (besides the pregnant reasons I haue heard you giue for this pointe) our sauiour him selfe doth testifie it in expresse and plaine words. Neuertheless, vncle, I see t'is the course of the world not to esteeme of a smale part of a great number, but to looke only vpon the greatest part. Which whether it be the shortnesse of our dis- *Matth. 16.*

courſe, and in Gouerment, not able to reach to particulars, or whether it be the mutabilitie of nature, not ſuffering it ſelf to be bound to ſome one ſtraine though the beſt and perfecteſt, which cauſeth this our vnhappineſſe I know not, but ſo t'is that a ſmale number is not regarded. Which I ſpeake to this pourpoſe, that one might anſwere your diſcourſe in a word, and ſaie. The good which the vſe of pictures bringe's is ſo ſmale and litle, that it is not worthie looking after, and therefore may well be neglected without anie great loſſe.

How the vſe of pictures Worke it's effect in man.

Vncle. Few words, cozen, may putt a man to agreat difficultie, And the rather in this matter becauſe the vſe of ima-

ges hath two conditions, the one that it worke's it's effect by litle and litle, so that the present effect is almost still imperceptible; the other that it is neuer the jmmediate nor the sole cause of it's effect, but hath euer some other cause ioyned with it, which may produce the same effect without it, so that, I saie, hauing these two conditions, t'is hard to shew the efficacitie of this cause, seeing we can nether proceede by shewing the want of the effect, this cause being substracted, nor by the chãge of the effect when this cause is putt. Neuertheleſſe to giue you some light and content in this pointe, Doe you remember the Turnet whom I was wont to imploye in London, how by

taking awaye litle shauings, and in deed so smale and thinne as that you might see through them, he would in a quarter of an hower bringa great and rough sticke to be as litle and smooth as he desired, which suppose he had beene three days a doeing, and yet perpetually a working of it, by reason of the matter or qualitie of the worke, he might be said perhaps to haue wrought well and hard, though the effect of euerie particular stroke did not appeare.

Nephew. I conceiue your meaning alreadie, for as those shauings would be (specially in your supposition) as it were inuisible, and a looker on, not seing where the shauings were heaped together (for the e

I doubt

I doubt not but they would be easily seene) would thinke the workeman did only presse and smooth his worke and noe waie lessen it. So I imagine you will tell me, that the pious affections gained by the vse of pictures produce at length a great effect in our soules, though it be imperceptible in euerie particular actiō, and consequently the time imployed therein no-lesse profitable for our end, then the Turner's for his.

Vncle. You are in the right, nephew, only I will tell you Aristotle saie's that Poetrie is a painting in words, And although I intende not to compare the force of a picture to the force of poetrie, yet if you knew as well what strong and

vehement motions and affections may be, and are produced and imprinted in the people's soules in some countries by meere dumme showes and representations without all life and action, as well I saie, as you knowe the force of our plaies in London, you would saie there's more truth in Aristole's words then euerie one conceaue's, And that the effect of pictures and of poetrie is of the same kinde, And may be compared as a slow and vnreadie Turner to a quicke and nimble one. And therefore conclude that the effect of pictures is not litle, but but their operation sometimes imperceptible.

Nephew. You haue said soe much, that now I haue a scru-

pule on the contrarie side, I rather feare that the vse of pictures should be taken awaie, least they should worke toomuch, and induce men to Idolatrie, conceiting that the verie materiall Images haue some hidden vertue in them. So I haue heard the Emperour of Constantinople caused *statuas* to be taken out of Churches, because some Priests abused them by counterfeiting miracles, And I am told that in some Catholike Countries the people will not suffer old pictures to be changed into new, Nay that euen our Deuines attribute I know not what particular assistance of God to one picture rather then to an other, And lastly hat some ignorant people ha-

uing beene asked, haue professed that a Crucifix was Christ, others haue spoken vnto pictures as to liuing things, and the like.

Vncle. And I haue also heard that a pore woman being examined vpon hir death bed about the three persons of the S. Trinitie, said the *sonne* was this great light which brings vs day, nor could she be taken of it, hauing beene long deceiued by the equiuocation of sounde betwixt *sonne* and *sunne*, thinke you therefore, cozen, that it were fitt to take awaye the preaching of the B. Trinitie for such errours? I know you doe not. In such questions we must balance the good of the institution with the capacitie and likelyhood

o ferrour and harme which may come thereby. For euerie discreete man knowes well that man's nature is subiect to doe it self mischeefe euen by the best things. How dull and blockish, and how nothing better then the stocke or stone it self which he admire's, must that man be (if he haue but had anie indifferent instructiō in Christianitie) who can beleeue that a piece of wood or marble is that *God and man* whom he hath heard preached to haue beene borne, liued, and dyed vpon a crosse, and now to raigne in heauen? Certes, cozen, t'is euident to awise and moderat man that the fault is not in the doctrine but in the want of instruction, and consequently, *that* were

to be mended, not the vse of pictures taken awaie, which doe vniuersally good, though some particular harmes come by their occasion from n other cause. Wherefore the Greeke Eperour had donne more wisely to haue punished seuerely those impostors, then to haue taken awaie such an instrument of deuotion. And this same answere may be applyed whith conuenient proportion to those people who are so zealous towards their old pictures. And for Diuine's opinions I intēde not to binde controuersies of Religion to their *Quæres*, nor to mingle them in our discourse, the more common this fault is amongst vs, the more it is to be auoided. Only I will add

that if anie tell you the frequent vse of pictures make's them to be of litle or no effect, your answere is radie, that the like may be said as well of those common and continually present meanes which God Allmightie ordained in the old law to put men in minde of his commandmẽts, as also of anie other meanes how efficacious soeuer, to witt preaching, prayer, frequentation of the Sacrements and the like, if they be commonly vsed and practized. But to goe on in our discourse, what shall we saie, cozen, of

The honnoring of Saincts, their Canonization, and of the institution of Religious orders, are they likewise necessarie in §. 9

this same degree?

VVich that we may discouer the better, let vs consider the other two parts and conditions, which you tould me were necessarie for the breeding of vertue, to witt of esteeming it, and seing it to be possible. And I pray, what meanes of making a deeper impression of esteeme can there be founde then the veneration we giue vnto Saincts? For they being the men who haue footed out the stepps which wee must tread, if we intende to come to the same rewards, and attaine to the same happinesse wherevnto they are arriued, which is the greatest motiue of our vertuous liuing, can we doubt but

How the veneratiõ of Saincts breeed's deuotiõ.

S.

the higher conceite we make of the excellencie of their state, the greater and more ardent must needes be our desire, and the stronger our courrage to doe and performe what they did and practized. The greater esteeme the souldjer make's of the qualitie of a commander, the more he is readie to performe those actions whereby such honors are to be obtained. And the like in all conditions of the world. Now if you considere wherein consist's the honor which we giuevnto Saincts, you shall finde that t'is cheefly in three things. 1. In keeping their holy days, 2 Reuerencing their reliques and pictures, 3. In hoping good of them by praying vnto them.

Saincts are honored three Waies.

For we naturally thinke the greateſt goods to be in thoſe who deſerue honour and can doe good to others, and therefore we neuer make anie great conceite of thoſe things whence we can nether expect anie good, nor where vnto we thinke no honour due.

Nephew. I cannot but interrupt your diſcourſe with admiration to ſee how men, who ſuerly had not caſt awaie all thoughts of vertue, (ſithence they had ſo manie followers and were in ſo great eſteeme) ſhould vnder slight pretences, ſo weaken the maine ſtrings by which pore men were drawne to heauen, and that for a litle vanitie and deſire to appeare more learned then others How true is it, vn-

cle, that man hath no foe but himself. For not all the Tortures and Tyranies, not all the inundations of waters, and rauagings of fires that can be immagined, could euer haue donne so much harme to mankinde, as the verie taking awaie of the esteeme and conceite which we Catholikes haue of the excellencie and greatnesse of Saincts, and of the happy estate which they enioye, and which is the end we all ayme at.

Vncle. Oh! cozen, if Alexander, Cesar, or anie of your great glorie hunters had considered in their life time (what now peraduenture to their great greefe they cannot be ignorant of) the difference that there is euen in this worl-

dly and vaine glorie betwixt Peeter the fisherman or Paul the tentmaker[who neuer aymed at this honour, but thought it worse then the dust which they shaked from their shooes)and them selues, who pourſued it so keenely with perpetuall dāger of their liues, wasting their estates and Coũtries, and ruining their neighbours, if this, I saie, they had then knowne, would they not haue changed their mindes, and followed other courses? And doe they not now mauger them selues and teare their verie soules in pieces to seetheir owne follie, and their no lesse witlesse then graceleſſe ambition? And doe you not thenthinke that the holy church vseth in this a most of-

ficacious meanes to bring men to a vertuous life, being she doth by this doctrine of honoring and praying to Saincts so strongly commende vnto vs the glorie and Blisse after which we ought to thirst and hope, if we be true Christians?

Nephew. For the two first points I confesse you haue reason, but for the third I feare you will not come so well of, For the easier it is to obtaine anie good the more wee esteeme it ours, and consequently the more hart we haue to goe about it. And what waie can be thought more easie then to make a cõceite of Christ's goodnesse, and thinke that without anie paines or deserts on our side

he will giue vs that great reward according to his owne pleasure more or lesse purely and only out of his mercie and goodnesse whitout anie respect or regarde to our workes or liues in this world? Where as we Catholikes make the gates of heauen so narrow, and the paths therevnto so rougged, that we seeme rather to deterre then exhorte men to vertuous liues.

Vncle. If ether we or they could thinke to come to Bliss whithout good life, I should not wōder at your propositiō, for in that case it were the best and only course to haue a great confidēce in him whose guift it is, But if Christ hath nether left anie such waie, nor you or anie vnderstanding mā

believe that faith with a wicked and careleſſe life will bring a mã to ſaluatiõ, Cã you thinke that ſuch an exaggeration of faith and confidence, and ſuch a diſeſteeming of good workes can be a meanes to perſuade and incite men toſticke cloſſe and perſiſte in vertuous actions, which by all our confeſſions are requiſite and neceſſarie to ſaluation? Surely the Catholike church taketh the ſecurer waie, And the reaſon is, becauſe workes in the waie of merite (that is, done for God's ſake and with hope of heauen) cannot be without faith, but how eaſie it is for a man to perſuade him ſelfe that he hath much faith without working, we finde by dayly experience. Hence it is

The force of examples in man's life.

that the Catholike church doth moue and perſuade vs to labour for our eternall happineſſe by propoſing vnto v the examples of men, as we are, who haue made this great conqueſt, in the moſt exact and ſolemne act of canonization of Saincts. And alſo of others who by profeſſing of extraordinarie labours make it appeare that the waie is not ſo hard but that manie dayly treade the paths of it, I meane in Religious profeſſions, in which all ſortes of auſterities are dayly practized before our eyes, which ought not to be derided and ſcorned, as manie doe. For what power the examples and conuerſatiõ of good men haue, euerie wiſe man know's. And for exam-

ples we see that all the dangers of the sea and warrs, that diuing into the bottome of the Ocean, and deluing to the center of the earth, hanging on ropes and scaffolds, and what soeuer man hath inuented in this kinde doe not deterre men, where there is ether *profit* or *Admiration*. Let but one desperate *beginner* shew the waie, and he will not want multitudes of followers, so ether vanitie or gaine second his aduentures. And if the force of *Example* be so great, the losse of wanting it must needes be equiualent, and consequently the wrong done to Christians by taking it awaie must be no lesse. And therefore the question and controuersie whether it should

be maintened in the church or no, is of no smale importance.

Nephew. I perceiue well that you still continue (according to your promis) to shew the *necessitie* and *importance* of controuerted pointes of Religion by shewing their force and efficacitie of producing profitable and aduantageous effects for mankind's attaining and coming to eternall Blisse; and I see that this is a verie connaturall and efficacious proofe. But I feare all pointes of controuersies cannot be proued that waie. For, I pray, how should anie man shew me

§. 10. *That the Sacraments of order and Matrimonie, the Generalitie of Ceremonies, or the*

opinion of miracles are necessarie?

Vncle. You remember I proposed vnto you but now a diuision of some things which concerned the breeding, others the conseruation of vertue and deuotion. For although such things as augment vertue doe likewise of necessitie conserue it, yet there may be some things which properly are to conserue it, and not to augment it, or at least of two things which doe both, the one may conserue it because it breed's it, the other may augment it because it cõserue's it. Now therefore if we finde anie thing whose principall effect is only to hinder such contrarieties as would

distroye pietie and deuotion, such, properly speaking, doe not augment it of them selues, but yet they may be truly said to conserue it. Farther if you considere you shall finde that this hindering of cõtrarieties and opposites to vertue is performed two waies. First by remouing all such things as put men in feare of yeilding to the contrarie, which is a kinde of strengthening of man's weakenesse against these cõtrarieties. Secondly by diminishing and aswaging the force and violence of these contrarieties, ether in them selues, or in their action. In the first manner doe contribute all kinde of *Ceremonies*, and particularly those which are vsed in the instalements and Beginnings

of offices and charges, as the Sacraments of *Order* and *Matrimonie*. And likewise the opinion of miracles. For *Ceremonies*, their nature in generall is to put in men's heads the conceite of a high and sublime thing, whereby we proceede with greater caution and warinesse in the busines which we haue in hand. And for *miracles*, the beliefe and opinion of them once well grounded (as it ought to be) make's the people extremely apprehensiue of the presence of Almightie God, and of his immediate gouerment of human affaires. So that as to be ouer credulous of miracles is the signe of a light and imprudent man (for according to reason the stranger the thing

is, the greater ought to be the proofe which should make vs believe it) so likewise not to thinke that some miracles in common haue beene and are now done in the Catholike church, were to contradict the vniuersall and constant opinion of all good Christians, and deserue's to be suspected of not believing the particular prouidence of Allmighty God; which is the maine string where vpon all Christianitie and supernaturall Religion hãgeth, and which all Maisters of pietie and deuotion haue euer souht to grounde strógly in the harts and soules of men.

Nephew. But I pray, vncle, how will this be true in Matrimonie (for that concer-

ne's me he vſe whereof conſiſt's in ſuch a materiall and ſenſuall pleaſure? I haue often reflected why the Catholike church (which make's ſo great eſteeme of virginitie) ſhould place matiage amõgſt the Sacraments, and make ſuch great Ceremonies in the adminiſtration of it.

Vnde. You ſpeake like a youngſter, And I would to God your conceite and thought were not ſo deepely rooted in the harts of manie yonng men like your ſelfe. The Apoſtle tell's you that the right and *lawfull vſe of the bed is honorable*, and that woemen are to be ſaued by *Tocogonia*, that is, bringing forth of Children. God Almightie hath beſtowed this

Why t'is fitt that Matrimonie ſhould bea Sacramẽt? Heb 13. 1. Tim. 2

procreation of children vpon his seruants as a cheefe temporall Blessing, so we see in Abraham and in the good woman that entertained Elizeus; and suerly it was the first Blessing that God bestowed vpon his creatures. If you considere for what end God sanctifie's anie action, you shall finde t'is only for man's vse. And then reflect vpon the *goods* which follow the lawfull vse of this materiall action betwixt man and wife, and you will not wonder that God hath placed a Sacrament in matrimonie. I doe not doubt but the light of reason tell's you, that in respect of good œconomie a man's hauing but one wife, and his perpetuall cohabitation with him,

is

is the best manner of seculat liuing than can be, both for temporalities sake, and for hauing a quiet and contented life. Which supposed, Mariage must needes be a matter of great consideration. For ether a man must liue without a woman (which kinde of life is but for few) or with this womā after he hath once taken hir, And therefore it is of great importance that this manner of life of it's owne nature be conuenient and gratfull. Besides you know a man take's a great deale of naturall content in his wife, generally speaking, (which some times draweis him to straing inconueniences, vnlesse his passions and affections be well moderated and setled) for you know hee take's

hir for his best friend, his best seruant, and his deerest partner in all his businesses, supposing she be wise and prudent, and consequently euer complying in reason with hir husband's humour. Whereby you see that the making of a Mariage, and the vsage of it when it is made, is the pinne whereon doth hang the cheefe content and sweetnesse of a maried man's life, the good of his posteritie, the maine succesfe and prosperitie of his temporall estate or fortunes. And aboue all the breeding of his children, and the instilling of pietie and vertue into their tender harts, which may grow with their age and carie them to felicitie. Iudge now, cosen, whether it was not conuenient

and fitting that in the law of grace this Action should be elevated and rancked in the highest degree and order of those actions which God hath sanctified for the vse of man. And ought we not to commende and preferre the wisdomes of our forefathers before all other nations for making so great esteeme of it, and celebrating it with such great ceremonies?

Nephew. Truly I am to thanke you for this good lesson, because it may be of speciall vse for my selfe; And I could wish it were giuen to all men before they marrie. For my selfe, I thanke God, I am so well sped, that I neede not wish to haue learned it sooner. But I pray, vncle, lett me

know the other part of your diuision, that is which be those things you said were necessarie to breake the force of cõtrarieties and temptations against vertue, and which might comfort and strengthē men in this distresse? I doe imagine that you ayme at some things which you will hardly proue. As for Example, doe you thinke that for this end

§. 11.

Praying for the dead, Extreme vnction, and Confession are necessarie?

VNCLE. Setting a side the temptations of sensuall pleasure which we suppose to be moderated by mariage, there remaine's feare and

griefe. Feare is cheefely of death and iudgment following. Griefe is of losse, which to rationall men is, aboue all other things, of friends, of whom the cheefest is Almightie God, who is lost by sinne: the next is of temporall friends, who are principally lost by their death. This last is taken awaie by the beliefe of their surviuing, and that once we shall enioye them againe. Whence proceede's the desire of continuing amitie and communication with them, which being only to be had by the mediation of Almightie God, it cannot be performed but by praying for them, if we thinke they stand in neede. And so a great part of this griefe is taken awaie

How prayer for the deadde appease the griefe of the liuing.

amongst Catholikes by the diuersion of care to gett prayeres said for them, and an other part turned to Almighty God by hoping good for them at his hands. Whereas others giue their friends ouer in death with a farewell frost, or else are plunged in vncurable sorrow for an vncurable losse, for the beliefe of enioying them againe when there is no communication in the interim is but cold comfort, and sinke's not deepely, as things farre from vs, doe generally litle moue vs. The feare of death is much moderated by the Sacrament of Extreme vnction. The assistance which vertuous parish Priests afford to the pore languishing patient by the Administration

How Extreme vnction doth moderate the feare of death.

of this Sacrament, comforting him and praying for him, according to S. Iames his commande and the Churche's practize, must needes be of great consequence in such an Exigent. Nay what comfort so litle which in this periode of distresse and last moment of death's agonie is not great? It was not surely without mysterie (said a great paterne of perfection euen in our age) that our Sauiour Iesus Christ would haue his Apostles accompanie him and praie with him in that dolerous Agonie which he passed in the garden of Gethsemani, and how much he desired it doth sufficiently appeare by his twice going to them to see how they performed their charge, and by Iac. 5. Gregorie Lopes.

his exprobration to S. Peter. Now there resteth only to seeke a remedie for a conscience loaden with sinne, which how great a torture it is of it selfe, you may easily imagine by the expression and apprehension which the heathens had of it, who were persuaded that Diuills or furies did stand continually with burning torches before wicked men's eyes, and that the Ghosts of murdered persons did haunt the murtherers vntill they brought them to madnesse or some mischeefe. And we are taught both by nature and experience that the best and ōly remedie to a soule loaden with a secret griefe, is, to disclose hir case, and the cause thereof, to some faith-

How confession is grounded in nature, and What comfort it bring's to a sinner.

full friend who may afford him comfort and assistance. For this end did our saviour Iesus Christ institute the Sacramẽt of *Penance*, with the priuiledge of silence not violable at anie rate, no nor God nor man's law can exact in anie case the reuealing of this secret, what damage so euer where to come of it. Which let but anie vnpartiall and vnderstanding mã considere, and then let him iudge of what profit and commoditie it is to a multitude of men, (not rained downe from heauen impeccable but framed like scarabees of the dũg of the earth and thereby full of imperfection and weakenesse) to haue by order of law some selected persons of learning and discretion, vnque-

ſtionable of what they ſhall heare, and extremely to be punished if they ſpeake the leaſt word of what ſhall come to their knowledge by this meanes, ſett to comfort and direct them for the amendment of their liues, and on whom they may confidently relye for Counſell, and open the truth of their cauſe. He knowe's not what a friend is worth, who knowe's not how great a benefit this is.

Nephew. I eaſily believe, (and I thinke euerie indifferent man muſt needes believe the ſame) that the practize and execution of this pointe alone would make ſo great a change in the people's behauiour, (if it were as well performed as it may, and ought to be) that

hence only it would be cleere and euident *that Religion* to be better in which this were practized, and *that, the verse* which refuſed it. But I wonder, vncle, that all this while you haue ſaid nothing of that famous queſtion of cõmunicating vnder both kindes, which ſo manie verie moderate Proteſtants ſtand vpon as a cheefe ſtumbling blocke which offendeth them.

Vncle. That's a point, nephew, in which the affirmatiue part belonge's to them, And therefore it behoue's them to shew the vtilitie or neceſſitie of communicating in both kindes. Which if they cannot doe, and that we know God giue's vs no laws but for our good and profit, a diſcreete

Why cõmunicating vnder both kindes was not commãded.

man will easily, and may iustly presume that Almightie God neuer cõmanded it, but left it to discretion. And for them to bring anie euident proofe of a positiue commande (sithence the contrarie hath beene practized in some churches and to some persons (as children) in all ages) I thinke it neuer was nor can be done. These points are sufficient to shew that it is not out of obstinacie, or vaine glorie that the Catholike church maintaine's hir positions, and forbidde's communion to Protestants, but forced thereynto by great necessitie and true grounds of Gouerment, without which no communitie can subsiste. For if euerie pointe may be thus shewed to be of no smale im-

portance for the increase of vertue, as it may be, (according as you see by these which we haue talked of) how much more doth the Bulke of all together make a schisme deserving to be lopped from the tree of life? But cheefely that headstrong taking the bitt in the teeth, and that vnbridled ranging in matters of consequence without anie respect and awe of the power and authoritie ordained by Iesus Christ, or anie reuerence to their fore fathers or present Gouerment, the readie waie and common maxime of all sedition and rebellion in what communitie or cōmon wealth soeuer ether spirituall or temporall, which we see doe ordinarily follow when such Ar-

ſtionable of what they shall heare, and extremely to be punished if they ſpeake the leaſt word of what shall come to their knowledge by [illegible] meanes, ſett to comfe[illegible] direct them for the [illegible] ment of their liues [illegible] whom they may co[illegible] relye for Counſell, [illegible] the truth of their cau[illegible] knowe's not what a h[illegible] worth, who knowe's not [illegible] great a benefit this is.

Nephew. I eaſily believe, (and I thinke euerie indifferent man muſt needes believe the ſame) that the practize and execution of this pointe alone would make ſo great a change in the people's behauiour, (if it were as well performed as it may, and ought to be) that

hence only it would be cleere and euident *that Religion* to be better in which this were [redacted] and *that*, *the* [redacted] refused it. But I [redacted], that all this [redacted] said nothing [redacted] stion ofcō- [redacted] both kin- [redacted] verie mo- [redacted] and vpon [redacted] ding blocke [redacted] them.

[redacted] hat's a point, ne- phew, in which the affirmatiue part belonges to them, And therefore it behoues them to shew the vtilitie or neceſſitie of communicating in both- kindes. Which if they cannot doe, and that we know God giues vs no laws but for our good and profit; a diſcreete

Why cō- municating vnder both kindes was not commāded.

man will easily, and may iustly
presume that Almightie God
neuer cõmanded it, but left it
to discretion. And for them to
bring anie euident proofe of a
positiue commande (whence
the contrarie hath beene pra-
ctized in some churches and
to some persons (as childr
in all ages) I thinke it
was not can be done.
points are sufficient to
that it is not out of obst
or vaine glorie that th
tholike church mantaine
positions, and forbidde's com-
munion to Protestants, but
forced therevnto by great ne-
cessitie and true grounds of
Gouerment, without which no
communitie can subsiste. For
if euerie poinie may be thus
shewed to be of no smale im-

portance for the increase of vertue, as it may be, [according as you see by these which we haue talked of) how much more doth the Bulke of all together make a schisme deser- [illegible] lopped from the [illegible] cheefely that [illegible] the bitt in [illegible] vnbridled [illegible] of conse- [illegible] respect [illegible] and au- [illegible] by Iesus [illegible] aerence to [illegible] or present [illegible] the readie waie and common maxime of all sedition and rebellion in what communitie or cõmon wealth soeuer ether spirituall or temporall, which we see doe ordinarily follow when such Ar-

chi-reuolters beginne to feele their partie strong.

Nephew. This your last consequẽce touche's, me thinkes, a point which I haue a great desire to heare well discussed, to witt of the Pope's authoritie, which you know our Protestants pretende to be a great inconuenience in all politicall Gouerment.

Vncle. The old phrase permitte's not the shoemaker to iudge of anie thing aboue the shooe, nor am I willing to medle in this pointe or determine what is conuenient or inconuenient of the Pope's authoritie in respect of secular Gouerments. For being not skillfull in this matter and discoursing only, as you see, by common sense, I might per-

happs offende, though blameleſſe, in ventering beyond my ſkill, which would be imputed to the weakeneſſe of my cauſe. Only, this I know, I muſt and will honor the Pope as S. Peeter's ſucceſſor, and head of Chriſt his church vpon earth. Which authoritie I am ſure was neuer inſtituted, nor doth it tende, of it's owne nature, to the detriment or preiudice of anie lawfull Gouerment of what qualitie ſoeuer. And if thoſe were preſent, who, perhapps as ignorant as my ſelf in the rules of Gouerment, obiect ſo manie things againſt this authoritie, I durſt vnder take to anſwere and ſatisfie them all.

Nephew. Though you will not be pleaſed to medle in this

pointe yet can you not refuse to teach me how to answere the ordinarie obiectiõs which are made against our Religiõ, Which if I could solidly performe, I should make it cleere and euident

§. 12. *That good institutions are not to be giuen ouer for smale inconueniences, that the abuses are to be mended not the things taken awaie, and therefore that the partie which brake communion is to returne to the other.*

VVhere fore, I pray vncle, tell me what shall I saie to them who cast in our teeth that the Catholike Clergie's being vnmarried fille's the world with whoredome and

Adultery. That the riches of the Clergie deprive's commō wealths of the vse of a great part of their Countrie, by reason of their immunities. That the Clergie's strength is able to bādie now and then against the state. Nay that a Religious order, especially such an one as hath great power ouer it's subiects, is able, and not vnpractized, to bandie and make good it's part against both church and state, with no smale damage and dāger to thē both, if it they were not preuented. These things must needes auerte anie state, much more a schismaticall one, from our Religion, sithēce we suppose them to be of necessitie.

Vnle. As for the Clergie's

How the Clergie's chastitie and single life is conuenient.

chastitie euerie one knowes we confesse t'is not a matter of necessitie by the law of Christ. Yet that t'is most fitt and conuenient, I thinke, no wise man can doubt. For of all pleasures the carnall doth most affect sensible nature, and produceth the greatest extremities of passion in man, and consequently is the greatest binder of man to earthly things, and the greatest hinderer frō heauenly and spirituall thoughts that nature hath placed in mā. It were needlesse to tell you how vnfitt this sensuall imployment is for those men, whose maine life and action ought to be in preaching and teaching celestiall and supernaturall doctrine, and whose ayme, euen by their function

and profession, is to draw people from this clodd of earth and eleuate their mindes to God and spirituall affections. From wedlocke followe's the loue of wife and children, and the necessarie cares of household (which the Apostle cale's the afflictions or tribulations of the fleth) And from them the Euill Gouerment of the church, which ether must be hereditary, or neglected, the decessour euer streeuing to leaue nothing to his successour which him self can make vse of for the better prouiding of his children. And lastly the verie conceite of chastitie and the follitude or loneneſſe of an vnmarried man, breedeth an apprehenſion of the perſon in whom they are, whereby

1. Cor. 7

the people are much better gouerned by such an one. Nor is Celebate the cause of such disorders, as truly are found in some places too frequent; but the multiplication of Priests. Which in deede brings this sacred function into contempt amongst the laietie, (whose tutors and teachers Priests are by Christ's institution) and maketh them esteemed as seruants. And this also make's the Priests them selues to haue aleese conceite of their owne dignitie and dutie, whereby they become careleese of their honour and cariage. And to saie the truth considering the difficultie of chastitie in the frailtie of man's nature, t'is not likely that whole multitudes of men liuing in liber-

Why there should be but few Priests in the church.

tie and perpetuall occasions of falling, should obserue so hard a rule as is expressed by *Qui potest capere capiat.* Wherefore not the Ecclesiasticall commãde of chastitie (which you see is good and necessarie for the Gouerment of the church) but the multiplicatiõ of Priests [especially of yong and vnworthie ones) ought to be taken awaie and so the scandal would cease. Mat. 19

Nephew. You saie well, but I haue heard that multitudes of Priests are requisite for the magnificence of the church, for the conuenient hearing of Masse, especially on Holy days, and for the better Administration of the Sacraments and helping of both liuing and dead by the

ineſtimable ſacrifice of the Altar, which cauſeth manie to take prieſthood meerely out of deuotion.

Vncle. I haue heard manie ſaie ſo too, but they did not conſidere that the neceſſitie of Gouerment and inſtructiō is the cheefe neceſſitie of the church, and that the Clergie is made and inſtituted for this Gouerment (hauing the adminiſtration of the Sacramēts pourpoſly reſerued vnto them to procure them veneration and authoritie for the better performance thereof) and therefore not anie one ought to be made Prieſt, but for this end, to witt, for the neceſſitie of inſtruction and Gouermēt. And this Bishops ought to take care of, nor to beſtow

Priesthood but where the man's creation is necessarie for his flocke, and then Priests would liue better and be more honored. This was the practize of the primitiue church, vntill the Ambition of Deacons (who had the temporalities of the church in their hands) made them desire honour, and so were made Priests. And the like ambition I beleiue was the inuentor of those faire reasons which you alledge, for well may it be magnificence in a Prince to haue manie seruants, but to haue manie cheefe heads and Gouernors that must needes lessen their esteeme. And for hearing of Masses, if the people be well ordered and gouerned few Priests will suffice,

nor is the inconuenience so great as the multiplicitie of Priests. And the like may be said for the administration of the Sacraments, and for the helping of both liuing and dead by the holy sacrifice of the Altar. As for those who desire to be Priests out of deuotion, I thinke their deuotio would be more conformable to the pietie of our forefathers, if they did rather shunne then desire Priesthood, especially where there are so manie allreadie. And as in my opinion there cannot be an outward worke of greater pietie and charitie then to prouide the people of fitt instructors and Gouernors, nor almes better imployed then to procure this ef-

fect

fect: so contrarie wise I thinke there cannot be an acte of greater sacriledge and impietie, then to *order* and imploye vnworthie subiects in this kinde, and who soeuer out of faction, friendship, or careles-seneſſe should doe it are worse then Adulteres, Murtherers, or those whose sinnes crye to heauen for vengeance. But this I speake only of my owne opinion.

Nephew. Truly, vncle, I thinke you are in the right, though peraduēture there be not manie of your minde. For I see well enough that as to multiplie vnworthie judges and Gouernors in a common wealth were to ruine it, so likewise to multiplie vnworthie Priests is to hazard the spiri-

tuall good of Christianitie, and to make an vnworthie parish Priest is in a manner to damne the parish.

That the Clergie's riches are no prejudice to the tẽporall state.

Vncle. For your second obiection of the Clergie's riches, though I am none of those that thinke the Clergie, or anie other spirituall companie whom they affect, cannot be too rich, yet I see no such inconuenience in their riches but t'is easily remedied. For in all Catholike countries there be meanes found out to diminish their riches, and make them contribute to the necessities of the state and common wealth as fully as others in proportion, though in an honorable waie, as to let them haue their owne Collectors of the monies required at their

hands. Besides the Clergie not making anie vowe or profession of renouncing ether riches or honor, and bearing the greatest charge and office in the common wealth, t'is both fitting and necessarie that they haue so much wealth as is requisite for the due performance of their function, as, first to be out of sollicitude for conuenient mantenance, 2. to haue an equall conuersation with their subiects, 3. to giue example of the due and true vse of wealth, and 4. to breede a conuenient respecte of their qualitie and persons in those whom they are to gouerne by their persuasions and authoritie. And by these rules it may be easily knowne when the Clergie's riches are excess-

Why the Clergie ought to haue Wealth besides vertue.

siue. You will saie perhapps that the Clergie's authoritie ought to be grounded vpon their learning, wisdome, and cheefely vpon their vertue. And t'is true, but those whom they are to guide and direct hauing not, for the most part, eyes to see and iudge cleerely of such internall qualities, but generaly esteeme of the inward man by the outward apparence, t'is necessarie that they likewise haue those exterior helpes. For your third and last obiectiō I could quitte my self in a word and tell you, I intende not to iustifie the practize of anie, but only the *tenets* of the Catholike church, And if at anie time ether Clergie or Religious should bandie against the state

or common wealth it were the fault of the men and not of the institution, in which case God hath left meanes to curbe and punish them, for the Clergie being an essentiall and principall part of the cō-mō wealth, as well as ether the Nobilitie or commons, t'is the same case for all three, And such an acte were to be imputed to the weakneſſe of man's nature as well in the Clergie as in the other two. And so I hope you are now content for this pointe.

Nephew. I am for the Clergie, and see you haue reason, but for Religious orders t'is not the same case, for nether is there the like necessitie of them as of the Clergie, nor are they anie publicke part of the

common wealth, but only priuat institutions within it. Besides I haue heard wise and experienced men saie, that Religious obedience is easily turned into an instrument of faction. For their subiects being bound vnder paine of damnation to obey their superiour in anie thing that is not manifestly sinne, it giue's the superiour a mightie commande ouer the whole bodie (specially if it be purely monarchicall and that one man gouerne all) and thereby a maine power to swaye great multitudes at his will and pleasure. And I heard not lōg agoe an able man, (who hath beene imployed of late by our state in Catholike Countries) saie, that Princes some times were vehemently affraid of

their puiſſant combinations, and held it no ſmale point of pollicy to imploye and engage Religious orders in their intereſts of ſtate. Whereas for the Clergie they feared them not, hauing no ſuch obligatiō of obedience amongſt them, but only according to the *Canons*, nor anie dangerous dependence of forraine ſtates, but euerie man for him ſelfe and therefore vnable to doe the ſtate anie great ether ſeruice or preiudice by anie factious intelligence abroad.

Vncle. Lord ! coſen, how different is the truth from the common opiniō of the world. The truth is, coſen, Religious men are gouerned by vowes and rules or conſtitutions, their vowes make them Reli-

gious, their rules are directiõs for their liuing in peace and vertue. Their vowe of obedience, which you speake of, reacheth only to the spirituall education and progresse of their subiects, their rules are for the rest. If their vowes did reach to their temporall gouerment, then I confesse they were no Religious vowes but were to be suspected of factious cõbinations, and both church and state might and would be jealous of them, but t'is not so, and therefore they are laudable and no waies hurtfull in a common wealth. And for the Religious man's rule, which only, and not his vowe binde's him to all temporall subiection, t'is of no great importance, nay some of them pro-

feſſe that their rule obligeth not in conſcience (as the canon and ciuil law doth) no not vnder a veniall ſinne. Wherefore you ſee t'is farr from Catholike Religion to patronize anie banding againſt ether church or ſtate, and ſo farr that euerie Deuine will tell you, that obedience in ſuch a caſe is damnable both to the commander and obeyer. Nay they will tell you that if anie Religious order were come to that height of ambitiõ (which God forbid) as to bend their aymes and endeauours generally to the preiudice of the church or ſtate, ſeeking to to ruine the antiẽt and lawfull gouerment of ether of them, to ſett vp their owne, that in ſuch a caſe it were a ſinne to

enter into anie such order, and that the vowes of such as should be alreadie professed therin would not oblige thē to obedience, nor could such a institute be truly esteemed a Religious institute. And now I hope you are fully satisfied. I know there be diuers obiectiōs besides these which you produce, but either they pitch vpon abuses in stead of vses, as these doe, or else they ayme to take awaie the substance of a *thing*, be cause of some accidentall harmes which fall out in the vse and practize of it. As if one should forbid iron tooles by reason some times there happene's mischeefe by them, not weighing the vtilitie with the harme. Wherefore the Protestants, what soeuer

they hold, and saie that they doe not condemne Catholikes (which according to there rule of th' *Errabilitie* of all mē, and of the libertie they assume vnto themselues, they are bound to doe) yet in effect and in practize they doe it, And must needes or else deserte their pretences and disputes with the Catholike church at the verie beginning. For example if Luther or Caluin were vrged, Is the vse of reuerenceing pictures Idolatrie or no? They must of necessitie answere *yes*, or else they are conuinced to breake from the present church (whereof they are yet apart) without a sufficient cause. If they be farther pressed, Can you euidently conuince that

t is idolatrie? or may it be probablely mãtained that t is not? If they acknowledge they cãnot, then they are oppreſſed againe, If it be but peraduenture yes, peraduãture no, why doe you make a ſchiſme and diuiſion in the church, and not ſubmitte your ſelues to the beliefe of your forefathers and of the preſent vniuerſall church? If they reply that whether part is certaine, then each one may hold what he thinke's fitt. You vrge them againe, is this your reply certaine? can you conuince it euidently? or is it but only probable? if only probable, they are ſtill in the ſame ſnare, if certaine and euident, they might haue ſaid ſo of the firſt propoſition. But in deede it

were against common sense and too ridiculous for anie priuat man to vndertake to make an Euident conuiction and demonstration against the generall beliefe of the vniuersall church for so manie ages. And thus you see that these men who cannot cõuince anie thing against the Arrians, Nestorians, Pelagians, Berengariãs and the like (though condemned manie yeares agoe by the Catholike church) and thinke all probable that a cõpanie of learned and indifferent men haue doubted of, yea vse this for a maxime that such pointes must of necessitie be doubted of, as being not with in the reach of euident conuiction. Let but, I saie, these men come to write against

Catholikes, and you shall haue them pretende whole liſtes of demonſtrations, and whole pages will not ſuffice to reeken vp the abſurdities which they imagine doe follow out of ſome one Catholike pointe, ſo neceſſarie it is that theſe men contradict them ſelues who contradict the truth of Chriſt and his church.

Why the Proteſtants ought to returne to the church of Rome

Nephew. Your argument, me thinke's, is good againſt the firſt beginners of the breach from the Catholike church, but will not ſuffice againſt mē that nowe liue, who ſeeme to be a framed and ſetled church, and haue receiued this doctrine from their fathers. For we ſee that poſſeſſion, though at the firſt vnlawfully gotten, doth in time pre-

uaille, and quarells ceaſe euen where Princes are pretenders. If the welch men should now pretende to haue beene vnjuſtly put out of England by the Saxons, The Romans out of France by the french, The Greekes out of Italie by the Goths, who would thinke their quarells iuſt? So likewiſe why should the Proteſtants (though their time be not ſo long, nor their poſſeſſion ſo quiet) rather yeild to the church of Rome, then the church of Rome to them, or to the church of England for example, vnleſſe the church of Rome can demonſtrate hir poſitiõs againſt the Proteſtãts, which I haue not heard anie of our learned mẽ ſaie she cã?

Vncle. Although it be both

reasonable in all liklyhood, and peraduenture may be cõuinced, that who first parted and made the diuision ought in law of good gouerment to returne. And although I could likewise pretende, that the church of England compared to that church which liueth in communitie with the church of Rome is but a smale part and therefore bound to yeild to the greater, (for to saie that the Protestãts of England liue in communitie with all other churches but the Roman is manifestly falſe, since all other churches will Anathematize diuers of their *tenets*, and they also the *tenets* of other churches, nor is there anie rule of vnitie and cõmunion amongst them) Although I saie I could

vrge these and other reasons to this effect, yet I will only propose you two. The former shall plainely shew, that the Catholike church cānot yeild vnto Protestants without essentially ruining hir self, and therefore no possible vnion betwixt the churches vnlesse the Protestants will bend. For if the Catholike church doth essentially subsiste and maintaine hir selfe vpon this principle and grounde, that she hath receiued hir doctrine frō Iesus Christ by word of mouth and succession from hand to hand which cannot faile, put the case she yeilde's to the church of Englād in anie pointe which she holdeth vpō this principle, is it not euident that she must of necessitie forgoe

The Catholike church cannot come to the Protestants.

hir hold, and for sake hir only principle, where vpon is built all hir faith and beliefe? is it not manifest that she may as well forsake all, as anie one pointe which she holdeth vpō this tennor and motiue: sure it is. But the Protestants holding their doctrine and positions vpon no such tye, but only vpon their owne (at most probable) interpretation of the scripture, which they may change vpon better consideration, are vpon farr easier termes to yeild, and that without preiudice to their Religion or iudgment. Becausē *tenets* only holdē vpon probabilitie may be changed vpon anie good occasion or new knowne motiue without disparregment to the Authour. And certainely

what church soeuer doth not thinke hir selfe *vnerrable* in anie pointe, what she holdeth may be false, and therefore it were temeritie for such a church to hold anie pointe certainely true, And if she hold not anie pointe certainely true, why should not the verie reasons of state and interest seeke to haue them changed and setled secure and infalible, sithēce humane nature is euer inclined to believe what's for hir owne profit. The second reason doth proue that the Protestant is bound in nature and by the light of reason to yeild to the Catholike communion. For if nature teach vs that a Protestant's practize ought not to contradict his principles and iudgment of

his reason. And that the neces-sitie and force of Experience doth conuince most euidētly, that there is no Gouerment in a church without prescribing of some *tenets* and forbidding of others (restraining or punishing, if neede be, such as wil not complie with those prescribed Canōs or articles) And that t'is likewise euident that this is contrarie to the libertie of opinion which the Protestāt putte's for his first and cheefe maxime to approue his separation frō the roman church; will it not follow with out contradiction, that ether the Protestants must breake with reason and the nature of man, in holding libertie in their iudgments and vnderstandings, and obliging to obedience in

their will and practize: Or els they must close with the Catholike church in their iudgments, and professe the *inerrabilitie* of the church, at least so farr as obligeth hir subiects not to withstand or oppose, but to submitte and obey hir Canons and commãdes. And for your exãples of politicke states, which by possessiõ and prescription haue at length obtained right, you must remember that all their beginnings and groundes are vpon humane nature and consent of men, and therefore by the same law by which they were made they may be likewise altered. But the church of God was made by Christ and his Ministers, and therefore reasõ tell's vs, that hir institution is

to be inuiolably cõserued, nor ought or can anie prescription of time preuaile against hir. Wherefore sithẽce that church which the Protestants parted from, held an holdeth still that the church of God neither is nor can be but *one* in all ages and places (which position she professeth to haue receiued in the same manner and vpõ the same grounde as she hath receiued the rest of hir doctrine) they Protestants must of necessitie first shew that they are the true church of Christ, before they can pleade possessiõ or prescription. For if there can be but one church, no prescription can make them that *one*, sithence at their verie begining and euer since, an other both was and is in more

quiet possession then they, and pleade's the same title more strongly.

Nephew. Why then, vncle, I see there remaineth no other question but whether the Protestants can conuince their positions or noe? Which I believe would be a hard taske. Where fore, vncle, I thãke you hartily for this good lesson, It growe's late, I feare I shall hold you vp to long, t'is time for you to take your reste.

Vncle. T'is true, nephew, they ought in deede to conuince and demonstrate their *tenents*, and I know of no other waie they haue to doe it but by the scripture which we doe not hold to be sufficient to determine contro-

uersies without tradition. So that I haue no more to saye to you, but wish you may begine this new yeare with a good night's rest, which God send vs both.

Whether ſcripture alone is fit and able to decide controuerſies in Religion?

THis Dialogue containeth 15. parts or paragraphes.

1. *The Preface or introduction.*
2. *That tradition for ſcripture is not of as great force, as for pointes of Doctrine.*
3. *That tradition for ſcripture is not more vniuerſall then tradition for doctrine.*
4. *That it is impoſsible the text of ſcripture ſhould haue remained incorrupted.*
5. *What vncertaintie the errors of writers and copiſts hath bredd in ſcriptures?*
6. *What vncertaintie the multiplicitie of tranſlations hath bredd in ſcripture?*

7. That the verie repeating and reciting of an others words breedeth a varietie and vncertaintie.

8. The vncertaintie of Equiuocatiõ which of necessitie is incident in all writings.

9. That there riseth an vncertaintie out of this, that the scripture was written in languages now ceased.

10. The vncertaintie which followeth the particular languages of Hebrew and Greeke, wherein the scripture was written.

11. That the nature of the bookes of scripture is not fitting for deciding of controuersies.

12. Two manners of iudging of Religion out of scripture.

13. How scripture doth determine controuersies.

14. What lawes are requisite for disputation out of scripture?

15. Of an other manner of disputing out of scripture.

The Introduction. §. 1.

VNCLE. How now, cozen, what make's you so early this morning? could you not sleepe this last night?

Nephew. Yes indifferent well, I thanke God, but 'tis not verie early. How soeuer if I be troublesome I will expect your better leasure, for I am come only to tell you a scrupule that I had yesternight, which hath tormeted me euer since, And it is, that we Catholikes who beare so great reuerence and veneration to the holy scripture, receiue more of it then others, write infinite volumes of commentaries vpon it (as Paul's church yard can witnesse) and are so exact to

improue our selues (I meane our learned men) in the knowledge of it, should neuer the-lesse, when wee come to ioyne in the maine point, that is, to the decision of controuersies in Religion, seeme to fly of and recurre to other iudges, though we acknowledge it to be Christ owne Word and law. And now I haue told you my difficultie, I will leaue you to your better imployments, knowing how much you esteeme, and how precious you accompt your mornings, and therefore I will make bould to call for your answere an other time.

Uncle. Nay stay, cozen, God forbid I should thinke I could better imploy my time then in giuing you satisfaction in

question of such importance, or that you should be importune vnto me by desiring the knowledge of a thing so necessarie and so be seeming you. I were to blame if I would not leaue euen my prayers to assist you in this point, and perhaps an other time you will not be so earnest on it. Although I must cõfesse I am some what vnwilling to diue into this question, for I see by experience, that the one part seeketh by all meanes to destroy the authoritie of God's church, and the other seemeth to lessen the power of scripture for the deciding of controuersies, so that indifferent men, and as yet vnsetled, be left as it were without all meanes of coming to the truth. How soeuer ne-

ceſſitie excuſeth vs, for were our Aduerſaries able to performe what they promiſe, that is, to reſolue pointes of controuerſies by ſcripture, we were worſe thē beaſts if we should refuſe to be iudged thereby. But if to ſtand to ſcripture only, as they doe, be but a plauſible way to Atheiſme, and ſo the queſtion will only be, whether we muſt rely vpon a church or be Athieſts, (for we thinke by ſcripture alone, left without the guard of the church, nothing or at leaſt not enough for the ſaluation of mankinde, can be ſufficiently prouued) then euerie man wil ſee that we are forced by reaſō and Religion to make euident and knowne, as farr as we cā, the neceſſitie of relying vpon

a church, and to vse all our power to persuade men thereynto. And if you remember we said yesternight that Christian Religion, or the law of Iesus Christ, cannot be learned by witt and studie, but by authoritie, and by receiuing it from Iesus Christ; And that wee said likewise, that he is no true Christian, nor truly of the communitie of Christians (what so euer be his materiall beliefe) who doth not accept of that rule and meanes which Iesus Christ hath left and ordained for the receipt of his law (and the like of him who should follow anie other rule) which must needes be ether scripture, or tradition, or both, it will therefore euidently follow that ether we must be no

Christians, or accept and acknowledge tradition to be this rule, if wee can shew that the scripture is not fitt, nor hath the conditions requisite for the deciding of controuersies, nor was made or left to the church for this end.

Nephew. The greater is the necessitie of this question, the more gladd am I that I haue moued it, though me thinke's I my self might well see it is not fitt to make the scripture iudge of cõtrouersies, because we finde by experience that after so manie disputations, and so manie bookes written on ether side there is nothing resolued, nor are we the nearet an end, and therefore t'is euident that scripture alone will neuer decide and determine

our quarells and disputes.

Vncle. Well, cozen, since you will haue it so, our first question shall bee

Whether tradition for scripture be of as great force as it is for pointes of doctrine? §. 2.

AND first I pray you tell mee, doe you thinke that the Apostles, when they wēt about the world to preach Christ Iesus, carried with the all the bookes of the ould and new Testament, ether readie translated into the languages of the people whom they preached vnto, or else caused them to be translated by the first Christians?

Nephew. I neuer thought of this question before, but I see

well enough that they could not carie all with them, for some parts certainely were not made before they went to to preach, nay I am not assured whether anie part of the new testament was made before their dispersion from Hierusalem, so that well may they haue caried the ould Testament with thē, if they thought it fitting, but for the new, they could not, if I be not mistakē.

Vncle. It is verie true. I will tell you therefore, cozen, how the authoritie of the scripture, that is, of the new Testament, came into the church. An Apostle or Disciple writing a booke or Epistle cōmunicated it to that church or Countrie wherein he preached or to which he writte it, that church cōmuni-

How the new Testament was propagated.

cated it to their neighbours as the worke of such an Apostle, so by litle and litle it grew frō one countrie to an other vntill it was spredd ouer the whole Christian world. So that some countries had not the new Testament complete, (that is, all the bookes of it) for a long time. Wherefore no wonder that some haue doubted of seuerall parts thereof, being not able to auerre, as not assured (by reason of some accident) that such bookes were truly the workes of such an Apostle or Disciple, which not withstāding, better intelligece being gotten might be after wards receiued for scripture. And here you may note by the way, that the Roman church is that church to which

Why the canon of scripture is chefely to be had from Rome.

in reason wee ought to giue most credit touching the canon of the scripture. For Rome being at that time (that is, at least for the first 300 yeares) to the Christian world or rather to all the Christians dispersed in diuers parts of the world, as Loudon is to England; And that wee see the collection of things estimable, dispersed in seuerall Prouinces of our Kingdome, is sooner and better made in London then in anie other part of our Countrie, it must needes follow that the collection of the Holy scripture, or new Testament, was more exactly faisable at Rome, then at anie other place. But this by the way. For my ayme is to make you iudge, whether anie one

substantiall point, which the Apostles whith common consent preached through the whole world, compared to anie one booke of the new Testament, which soeuer you thinke first or best receiued, whether, I say, of these two haue descended vnto vs with more certaintie, the one to be the Apostles doctrine, the other to be such an Apostle's booke? *The state of the question.*

Nephew. I should distinguish your question, for ether it may be compared to that particular Prouince or church where the Apostle him selfe deliuered it both in word and writing, or to the whole church. And I confesse that in respect of the whole church, that point of doctrine which is euerie where preached must nee-

des haue more certaintie: but where both are equaly deliuered by the same Apostle to the same church, I should thinke the worke should haue more authoritie thē the word. For t'is an easie matter to let slipp a word some times, Whereas writing requireth a more setled consideration.

Vncle. If the question be but of a particular church or Prouince, I doubt it will not be sufficient to giue vs a firme authoritie for ether one or the other, vnlesse we add more circumstances then we haue declared. And the reason is, because one Prouince maye haue had Religion so ruinated in it by the incursion of infidells, that recouering thē selues after a long time they

may as well mistake one booke for an other, as one doctrine for an other, and so this point is not much to our pourpose. Although euen in this case the doctrine taught by word of mouth hath these aduantages. That it is deliuered to manie, the booke to few, or in some one place. The doctrine heard and vnderstood by manie, the booke only to such as can reade, nor to all them nether, but to such as are carefull. The booke belonge's not much to the practize of the multitude, the doctrine gouernes their whole liues. The booke brought often times by some one mā, as some messēger if it be an Epistl, or other wise sent from some other place or frō some one person, as from

Titus or Timotheus, to whom it was first written, and vpon whose authoritie only the whole veritie must originally rely. But to returne to our case. Doe you not see that the whole church trusteth some one particular man at the first vpon whom she buildeth hir beliefe tht this is such an Apostles worke, that is, *scripture*? But for anie materiall point of doctrine she relyeth vpō the vniuersall knowledge of thē who heard it preached in diuers parts of the world. So that, as I doe not intende to say, the one is certaine, the other not, (for a particular churche's authoritie may be certaine in some circonstances) yet I must needes say that betwixt these two cer-

tainties, there is such a differēce, that if the one were to bring in verdict vpon the other, it would be much more forcible and euident to conclude, that this booke is scripture, because it is according and conformable to the doctrine taught and preached, then that this doctrine is the Apostles, because it is conformable to this booke. For if it be true, that the whole church once relyed vpon some one particular church for this veritie, it can neuer come to passe that the certaintie of this booke proue greater then was the authoritie of that particular church at that time, And consequently the same comparison which is to be made betwixt the authoritie of this particular church

and of the vniuersall church, the same, I say, is to be made betwixt the certaintie of this booke's being scripture, and of this point of doctrine's being catholike and Apostolike. And for the inconuenience you were jealous of, it falleth out quite contrarie. For whether we considere the inspiration and assistance of the holy ghost, or the industrie aed carefullnesse of man, you shall euer finde that the end is more principally aymed at, then the meanes to compasse the end, and likewise amongst diuers meanes the most immediate to the end is still most aymed at, wherefore in our case the end both of writing and speaking being the deliuerie of this doctrine for the

good of the people, no doubt, I say, but that both the Assistā-ce of the holy ghost, and the care of man tendeth more principally to the deliuerie of this doctrine then to other things that came in by chance, in which only there might be a slipp, as you immagine. Wherefore sithence tradition containeth not all the words the Apostles spoke, but meerely what belong's to Christiā doctrine, (which was principally deliuered, and the cheefe errand of the Apostles) and that in the scripture manie things are written vpon occasion and as it were by the bye, no doubt but in both these respects, to wit, of the assistance of the holy ghost, and of the care of man, the certaintie will

be greater of the doctrine de-liuered by word of mouth, thē of the holy writt. Besides the slipps you speake of, are when things are only once deliue-red, or spoken without great premeditation, whereas this doctrine was a thing perpe-tually beaten on, so as there can be no feare of such slip-ping. For the ould Testamēt as I confesse t'is possible that the Apostles might haue deli-uered it in all Countries where they preached; so likewise I thinke t'is euident that they neuer did it, being that the church hath no such memo-rie, And that the Canon hath beene doubted of by some, and the Iewish Canon alleadged, whereof there had beene no vse nor neede, if the Apo-

How the old Testa-ment came to Chri-stians hands.

stles had left to all churches the booke it self. It is likely therefore that the ould Testament was brought in by the first Christians of the Circūcision, who accepted of those bookes which they saw the Apostles honnor and make vse of, and from them it came to the Gentill Christians, and so by litle and litle was accepted of by all the Christian church with the same veneration that the Apostles and Iewish Christians gaue vnto it. But how soeuer shall wee not thinke at least

That tradition for scripture is more vniuersall then traditiō for doctrine. §. 3.

Philo. Surely, vncle for my part Icānot thin-

ke but that the scripture hath a more vniuersall tradition the anie point of Christian doctrine, or at least then anie of those which are disputed betwixt vs and the Protestants, seeing that all Christians doe agree in the acceptation of the scripture, and farr fewer in diuers pointes of doctrine. For such churches as are in communion with the church of Rome are no such extraordinarie part of christendome if they were compared to all the rest.

Vncle. For the Extent of the churches I cannot certainely tell you the truth, because I feare manie are caled Christiãs who haue litle ether in their beliefe or liues to verifie that name. But you know

in witnesses the qualitie is to be respected as well, and more the the quantitie. So that such countries, in which Christianitie is vigorous, are to be preferred before a greater Extent of such as are where little remaines more then the name. But to come neerer to your difficultie, suppose that in a suite in law, one side had seuen lawfull witnesses, the other had as manie and twentie knights of the post, knowne periured knaues or vnlawfull witnesses more, would you cast the other side for this wicked rable?

Nephew. No truly, for seing the law doth inualidate their testimonie, I should wrong the partie to make anie accompt of them, and therefore

I should judge the parties equall.

Vncha. Why then you see that who will challenge a more vniuersall Tradition, for scripture then for doctrine, must first be certaine that there is no lawfull exception against those Christians whom he calleth to witnesse, or writ, against the Arrians, Nestorians, Eutychians and the like. Now the Catholike church accounteth these men wicked in the highest degree, that is, guiltie of Heresie and schisme. And therefore the partie which esteemeth of their witnesse, must, by taking of them for honnest men, beare him self for their fellow, and account the Roman church wicked and not fit for testimonie, from whom

whom neuertheleſſe he hath receiued what ſoeuer he hath of Chriſt. Beſides the witneſſe and teſtimonie which theſe men giue, is only that they receiued ſcripture from that church which excluded them from communion at their beginnings, and euer continued in oppoſition againſt them, to wit the Catholike. Wherefore it is euident that their teſtimonie addeth nothing to the teſtimonie of the Catholike church, but only declareth what ſhe teſtifieth, nor conſequently maketh anie tradiţō more vniuerſal. Let vs therefore now ſee whether

The text of ſcripture can haue remained incorrupted or no. §. 4

HItherto, we haue only compared the authorities of scripture in itselfe to tradition, now we will come vnto the matter, and compare it as we haue it, to the same doctrine deliuered vnto vs by tradition. I meane that hitherto we haue spoken as if we had the seuerall bookes which the canonicall writers made with their owne hands, and of what authoritie they would be. But now we will consider that since we haue but copies of them, of what authoritie these copies ought to be. Can you resolue this question?

Philo. I doubt not, sir, but for that end which wee seeke, that is, to make a iudge of controuersies, euerie word, euerie letter, and euerie title

must be admitted of absolute and vncontrolable certaintie. And so I heare the vulgar edition in latine is commãded to be held amongst vs. For I easily see that if anie one sentence may be quarrelled, euerie one will incurre the same hazard, all being equaly deliuered and equaly warranted with reason and authoritie.

Eudox. You daie verie well, for where there is no losse thẽ the soules of the whole world are the stake, I see not what aduantage can giue sufficient securitie, if there remaine anie notable vncertaintie. Our sauiour saith, *what can all the world auaile anie man if he loose his soule?* So that where the question is soule or no soule, saluation or damnation, nothing

leſſe then certaintie can ſerue to proceede vpon. And therefore no doubt but if the Apoſtles had intended to leaue the holy writt for the decider of controuerſies in Religion, they would alſo haue prouided that infallible copies ſhould haue beene kept and come downe to the church to the end of the world. For ſuch care wee ſee that priuat men haue of conſeruing their bargaines and couenants by making their Indentures vncounterfeitable, and enrolling them in publicke offices, were they are to remaine vncorrupted: the like care hath common wealths to conſerue their recordes, ſpecially their laws, keeping the verie originalls or authenticall copies with verie

great care. But what needs we looke into the examples of men, seeing Almightie God in his owne person hath giuen vs a patterne, commanding the Decalogue onlie to be kept in the Arke, which he would haue to be the authentical copie to iudge betwixt him and his people, and this with the greatest veneration that could be imagined, or that euer was giuen to anie thing. But this was impossible for the Apostles to doe (otherwise surely they would haue done it, if they had intended that Christs written law should haue beene our iudge) by reason of the multitudes of nations and languages which hindered that not anie one booke could be conserued with such securitie

and incorruptibilitie as would be requisite in that case, both because of the language, and of the mutabilitie of the world, euer subiect to a thousand accidents, whereby such bookes might fall into the hands of those who would not only neglect them, but eyther willfully corrupt, or seeke vterly to destroy *that* which was to be the rule and patterne of Christian faith. And for that which you say is commaded vs, you conceide amisse. For no wise man thinketh that the vulgar edition is so well corrected that much may not be mended; but it is that the church hath secured vs that there is nothing against Christian faith or behauiour contained in those bookes, which

How the vulgar edition is to be vnderstood.

hath so long passed for scripture, and are so in deede, for the substance of the bookes, and therefore hath commanded vs not to refuse this text in any controuersie or disputation. And this wee, and wee only can doe, for the church's certainty is risen out of this, that she hath an other, more forcible ground of her faith, to wit, tradition, by which being assured what the truth is, she can confidently pronounce that in this booke there is nothing contrarie or preiudiciall thereunto, which no profession that relyeth only vpon scripture can doe, because they must first be assured of the text, before they can iudge of the doctrine therein: therefore if the text it self needs a iudge, and

that it is questionable whether this be the true text or no, they must needes be at their wits end, according to the principles of raison. Let vs therefore see what ambiguitie or question falleth vpon the text it selfe: by the succession of so manie ages in which it must needes haue beene in some sorte conserued to come to our hands. There be three wayes cheefely whereby the text may haue beene corrupted. The first on set purpose, as the fathers accuse the Heretickes of their times to haue done: and the Iewes also are suspected of the same. And this kinde, though it extendeth it selfe but to few corruptions, yet they come to be incurable, whē amongst so manie copies

Three waies haue corruptions come into the Text.

neuer can discerne which haue beene so abused which not; and as it is but in few pointes or places, so it is in such as bee important and materiall ones. The second sort of corruptios may haue come by the negligence of scriuanes, which copied the Bible; some being mercenarie people that made copies to sell, others wittlesse people, who greedie and desirous to haue the Bible out of vanitie, hypocrisie, or the like, cared not for more then to saie they had it, and a great part of these copiists may haue erred in writing the Bible by the verie defect of nature, which permitteth not an absolute exactnesse in anie thing, and causeth a man in his wearinesse, nay and in his too much wari-

nesse also, to make escapes vnwittingly, which be the more dangerous, by how much the copies seeme more exact, whereby some times the beare down true copies. The third waye of corruption may haue beene by halfe witted men, who will now and then vndertake to correct copies by ayme and vnderstãding, who for hauing lighted right in some one place, will venter confidently to spoile tenne. And of these ment 'is like before printing began, and copies were not so frequent, and so a corruption went not farr, t'is like, I say, there hath beene diuers, who whẽ they mett with a place they could not make sense of, and saw that a litle change would make it sense, such rash

men would easily venter to make such a change (as they thought) mutation, not knowing peraduenture how to come to a better copie then their owne. The Hebrew and Greeke Testament haue beene verie subiect to the first sorte of these corruptions, the former being deliuered vnto vs by the professed enimies of Christ, who, as it is reported, in the greatest heat of their hatred to Christianitie, sate at Tiberias to determine all the vowels of the ould scripture, the which euerie Hebritian knoweth what power it gaue them to change the whole text, and this to men publickely accused of forgerie in that kinde. The Greeke, as long as the condemned Heretickes held so

great power in those parts, as is publickely known: yet they did for some ages, vnder lesse jeopardie, they being also taxed with the like impieties. For the other two wayes and meanes of corruptions are common to all, and in deede vnauoidable in so great a multitude of copies as were in all the three languages, or at least of Greeke and Latin. And now cozen, can you tell mee what hazard this must needes breede in the text it selfe that is

What vncertaintie the errours of writers and copiists hath bredd in scripture? §. 5.

NEPHEW. Nay mary that posseth my vnderstanding, for if I should calculate

so manie copies to haue beene made, that then is it more, that errours may haue escaped in euerie copie, the number peraduenture, would exceede the words of the Bible. For let vs take a booke of three columnes, and let vs likewise suppose, (which is verie likely) that as manie copies were made in some age of an hundreth yeare, and let vs then put 56. lines to a columne, and 6. words to a line and so there will be in one columne 336. Words. And further may wee not well suppose that there was as manie faults escaped in euerie copie (one with an other) as there bee words in a columne, which being supposed you will finde that the number of all the errours escaped in all the copies

which haue beene made since the Apostles time, will amount to 15. or 16. times as many as there bee words in the Bible. Wherefore by this accompt it would be 15. or 16. volumes of one particular place that is were not the true text. Which me thinkes cannot be true.

Pinde. I doe not thinke that you haue taken your proportions too high, for if you looke into the most part euen of printed bookes of such a great volume as the Bible is, reuewe them well and you will finde a whole columne of *errata* in euerie one, and you know printing is donne with more ease and lesse toile to the braine, and hath ordinarily 2. or 3. corrections before it be drawne, which helps writ-

ten copies haue not. But yet I must tell you that you misse it in one thing, you marke not that the errours of so many copies may haue beene the same in diuers of them, otherwise truly your calculation would proue that we might looke for a scripture in seuerum and not finde it, and the like with some proportiõ in all bookes. I saie with some proportion, for to thinke altogether the like of Cicero, Demosthenes, and others, is not reasonable, because there were few copies made of them, as only for some curious and learned men, whereas the Bible concerned euerie man so nearely that few would be with out it that could vnderstand Latin. And yet I

doubt not but you remember well inough, since you were a student, what varietie of texts and pretentions of corruptions you found amongst the Critikes and commentaries vpon of those prophane authours. And to your calculation I will add an other. Suppose there were as manie written copies extant as the number of your columnes, and as much varietie in those which haue not beene examined as in those which haue beene looked into, And farther that *Sixtus Quintus* for the setting out of his Bible caused only an hundred to be examined, and that in his Bible the corrections amounte (as it is knowne they doe) to the nũber of two thousand, doe you not see that the

computation made of the seuerall sections of all those copies would make twentie for euerie colume? And truly we cannot imagine that there hath beene so few either Latin or Greeke copies. And whereas in this computation wee only esteeme them to haue beene but 1000. suppose, as is verie like, that there hath beene at least an hundreth thousand in other language in so manie ages and in so great an extent of readers. And those which are not Extant (Whereof none in particular can be reiected) make the case more ambiguous, because they giue the power out of such or such a probabilitie to coniecture a truth, and out of coniecture all proofe to beliue it. For as we all con-

fesse that whatsoeuer is certainely knowne to be scripture, is not to be touched, so we know likewise that whatsoeuer may be doubted of, whether it be scripture or no, neglecteth no such respect. Wherefore if reason concludeth and tells vs, that in all likelyhood there hath beene *twenty seuerall editions* in euerie particular columne, though perhaps two or three only are extant, the rest probably knowne to haue beene, yet so as that there is no certaine signe of which or where they were. And now there commeth one to presse a place in this or that columne, which his opponent thinketh to be contrarie to other places, may he not then iustly say to him, I mistrust this

place to be corrupted? Or can his Aduersarie in prudence vrge it on as an assured text? Or can he presse and vrge for certaine that this is none of the 17. vnknowne *verse lines*? Certes he cannot abstracting from all warrant and commande of the church and standing to pure and priuate reason. So that all controuersies would be ended where nothing but scripture is admitted as iudge with *Non liquet*.

Nephew. I expected you should haue shewed me how hard it is to agree about the true sense of the words of the scripture, but as I now perceiue there is as much difficultie to know whether we haue the true and right text or no.

which if it were well conceited and vnderstood by our deuout and pure citizen's Wifes of London, who turne and vewr the text so curiously whe the preacher citeth it, I beleue it would much coole the zeale of their spirit if such a qualme should come ouer their stomackes as to thinke, these words peraduenture are not the *Holy scripture*. But to this, vncle, may you not add the varietie of translations? I pray tell me

§. 6. *What vncertaintie the multiplicitie of translations hath bredd in scripture.*

VNCLE. No doubt, cozen, but great vncertaintie is sprung from the varietie of translations, Whereof we may first suppose, that there is no

what of the septuagint translation.

ryour of anie infallibilitie in the translatours, no not of the Septuagint them selues, which the Protestants will easily grãt. I know there is a storie how that the septuagint being seperated one frõ an other, their translatiõ light to be the same word for word. Which if it were certaine, I should esteeme their translation of as great authoritie as the originall text it self. But we see that euẽ in the Apostles time some sought to mende their interpretation, as Theodotion and Aquila, whose translations were neuertheless accepted of by the church, and conserued and esteemed. Wherefore there is no likelyhood that the Apostles and the church of their times held the *septuagint*

translatio to be specially from the holy ghost. Nor doe they impute that the Apostles some time vsed in their speeches or writings this translation, for they must needes vse it of none but they wrote to those whose language was Greeke, and therefore would haue thought them to haue mistaken the text if they had cited the scripture's words according to the Hebrew, when the Hebrew was different from the Greeke. Nor can wee certainely tell that is was alwayes the Apostle that vsed it, and not the Historian, who writing in Greeke and to Grecians cited the Greeke words, what words soeuer the Apostle had vsed, being both to the same effect. The next point which we may

consider in this variete of translations is, that neuer anie became a new version in the same language but for some mistake in the former. For if he thought a new trãslation to be necessarie, he must needes conceiue that the former trãslator had in manie and important pointes missed and altered the minde of the author. Whereby euerie wilman will see that a booke of importãce is neuer left of to be translated, vntill there be some inhibition to the contrarie. And hence we may conclude that it is impossible for a translator to be so exact as that his words shall be taken for the words of the author. Nay contrariewise it is the law of a good translator not to yeild word for word

why diuers trãslations in the same tongue.

with the verie of ginall, but to expresse the sēe thereof in the best manner he can. For since no two lāguages jumpe equaly in their expressions, it is impossible that euerie word of the one should haue a full expression of euerie word of the other, much lesse that their phrases should be the same, so that per force there must needes be a great differēce in particulars, although the substance of the sense and meaning be the same. And who should conferre anie one chapter of two translations in the same language, and see whether anie one sentēce doe so exactly agree as that scanning rigorously the varietie of their words, there may not be some different sense gathered

thered out of them, And he will not denie but t'is impossible to put fully and beyond all quarell the same sense in diuers words. And truly I thinke that euerie one will admit at least as much difference and varietie betwixt the originall and the translation, as betwixt translation and translation, these agreeing in the same tongue, those not, and yet hauing all the other reasons of disagreeing. And doe you not thinke cozen, that if one should take twentie of the best schollers in a schoole and giue them an author to translate ether out of latin into English or out of English into latin, that their translations would so differ in manie sentences as that diuers

ſenſes might be eaſily gathered out of them, And iudge there vpon that when witts are ſett contentiously to diſcuſſe euerie poſſible varietie, what truth can be conuinced where anie two may diſagree, though both acknowledge the author? An other conſiderable circũſtance is, that amõgſt all antient tranſlations none can be reiected, becauſe it may euer be ſuppoſed, that the reaſõ of this varietie may proceede from a various copie out of which they were tranſlated, and by reason we cannot diſapproue the copie, as wee ſaid before, we cannot therefore likewiſe nether iuſtly nor certainely refuſe the tranſlation, hauing nothing to grounde ſuch refuſall but coniectures

and likelyhoods which be verie imperfect. And if we come to calculate, we may verie well suppose that there are now sometwenty translations made into seuerall lãguages. I might put more, for there hath beene peraduenture 200 latin translations, considering the greatnesse of the Roman Empire for so manie Ages, and the esteeme of the booke making euerie man desirous to haue an exact text, none being as yet euer acknowledged for such, nor anie prohibition of translating scripture. Which varietie of latin translations the Protestants them selues acknowledge, and saie verie well that they perished after S. Hierome's correction and amendment of the Bible,

whose complaints of the varietie of texts all the world knowes, and indeede the inutilitie and discommoditie of such multiplicitie caused them all to be neglected, though some thinke our *vulgata editio* to haue euer beene conserued. Howsoeuer we may goe on with our supposition, and add, that of those twenty trãslatiõs now extãt euerie one is equall to anie other. Let then a sentence be proposed, whose nature and definition is to decide a controuersie, but with this condition, which ordinarily happeneth in such a case, to witt, that it dependeth on the proprietie of some word, or on the Emphasis of some manner of speaking. Is it possible that anie reasonable

man should thinke that all these translations will agree in such a thing? Three or foure peraduenture may, but for twentie 't is absolutly impossible, And if anie one of these translations be substantially different all the rest cannot with certaintie or euidence beare it downe, fithence this might be out of a different copie with which perhapps agreed more then we haue, so that we shall still returne to our former *non liquet*. And hence followeth that although a translation in the whole bulke be morally the same booke with the originall, yet metaphysically and rigorously there is great diuersitie, and at least *such*, as in our case maketh all translations of the

scripture vnfitt to decide cõtrouersies by them.

Nephew. Your discourse will not only make mee beleeue what I haue heard reported S. Augustin should saie, that *hee would not beleeue scripture, vnlesse the church's authoritie moued him therevnto*, but I feare it tendeth to the too great weakening of the scripture, which hath beene so happily planted in the church, and got this supereminent authoritie which it hath, to some good effect, without doubt, though not for the decision of controuersies, and therefore you will proue to much, and in seeking to destroy one errour you will bee in danger to fall into an other. This I am sure of, that if you should

Epist. Man. fundæ. cap. 5.

preach this doctrine at S. Antolins, the people would stone you with their brasencornerd Bibles, though peraduenture if they laid all their heads together they could not giue you a sufficient answere. But thus much I learne, now when I reflect vpon them, that they haue no reason to obiect against vs our trusting of our church and Pastours for the sense and explication of the scripture, whereas thē selues must needes rely vpon a douzen or twenty Parsons or Ministers (if there were so manie imployed in their translation) for the verie text it self, whose skills or wills might be defectiue according to their owne maxime, so that we rely vpon the whole church, they, pore

people, vpon what they nether thinke certaine, nor infallible, nor probable, but as farr as they pleaſe.

Vncle. I will finde a time to ſatisfie your feares of my diminishing the ſcripture's authoritie, and will ſhew you how all I haue ſaid doth nothing preiudice the lawfull and intended vſe of the ſcripture, and if I ſhould chance to forget, I pray you put mee in minde before we part. For the preſent I will propoſe you an other difficultie, which is,

§. 7. *Whether the verie rehearſing and citing of an others words doe not breede varietie and vncertaintie?*

AND let vs suppose the writer him self play the translatour, As for example, that our sauiour him self hauing spoken in Hebrew or Syriake, the Holy writer is to expresse his words in Greeke or Latin, And farther that this which we haue said of translatiõs, be (as truly it is) grouñded in the verie nature of diuers languages, and therefore vnauoidable by anie art or industrie, will it not clearely follow that euen in the originall copie writtẽ by the Euãgelist's owne hand, there is not in rigour the true and self-significant words of our sauiour, but rather a comment or Paraphrase explicating and deliuering the sense thereof. Nay let him haue written in the

ſame language, and let him haue ſet downe euerie word and ſillable, yet men conuerſant in noting the changes of meanings in words, will tell you, that diuers accents in the prononciation of them, the turning of the ſpeakers head or bodie this way or that way, the alluſion to ſome perſon, or to ſome precedēt diſcourſe, or the like, may ſo change the ſenſe of the words that they will ſeeme quite different in writing from what they were in ſpeaking. So that you ſee how like negligent men wee cōmonly vſe to preſſe words, as the proper and identicall words of our ſauiour finding them regiſtred in the *Holy writt*, Which in rigour and exactly ſpeaking are but in

some sorte an imperfect and equiuocall paraphrase or expression of Christ's owne true words, the weakenesse of mā's speach and expressiō bearing no greater exactnesse. And surely all experienced men, but especially disputatife schollers (who finde meanes dayly to explicate the planest words of ā authour to a quite different sense) will tell you, that to seeke to conuince an exact truth out of bare and dead words, is to put your self into a darke some and wild labirinth, And to rely vpon them, is to fixe the Camelions colours in the currēt of the winde or water. Wherefore, cozen, hauing, I thinke, sufficiently tould you my minde concerning the text it self, let

vs goe farther and looke into

§. 8. *The vncertaintie of equiuocatiõ which of necessitie is incident in all writings.*

AND to proceede more clearely wee will suppose for the present that there is but one authenticall copie of the scripture, written in some one language, and hereby abstract from all varieties of *texts* by translations, or errours, or anie such accident, and meerely considere what of necessitie followes out of this, that the scripture is abooke written in words of men, and whether this supposed, there can be anie decisiue and decretory sense euidently and certainely gathered out of it.

Tell me then, cozen, doe you thinke t'is an easie matter to decide cõtrouersies by words? or why not?

Nephew. I know words are but signes of what is in our mindes, sett and ordained to that ende by the will of man, and therefore that diuers men signifying their mindes by diuers signes, come to make diuers languages. And I know likewise that though it bee an ordinarie thing amongst vs to hange vp a bush to signifie thereby that in the house there is wine to be sould, yet peraduenture in an other coũtrye some thing else may signifie the selling of wine, and a bush some other thing. So may it happen that the same word in one language may

What arts words.

signifie one thing and in an other, some thing else. And becauſe I likewiſe ſee that it may ſo fall out that theſe two nations ioyne in one, or haue much commerce together, by vſe and cuſtome this word may come to haue two ſignifications, euen in the ſame language. And ſo will breede a difficultie in whether of the two ſenſes it is to be taken, which I cõceiue is caled Equiuocation. And ſithence there is no other grounde for ether of theſe ſignifications but man's will, which cannot be eaſily demonſtrated, I know not well how the truth can bee certainly knowne.

The origine of equiuocation.

Vncle. You ſaie verie well, for the ſignification of words muſt needes depende of mã's

vill, and of the custome or vse of them, two verie mutable things. Wherefore separating these two, and taking words in them selues, you shall finde that man's will doth put diuers significations vpon the same word, ether by chance, or on sett pourpose; by chance as you declared but now, which in deede doth not reach to manie words, but is casuall as the cause of it is; on sett pourpose, and that ether for want of words, or by desire of elegance and varietie in our deliuerie, And this belongeth to allmost all the words wee haue, for there is scarsely anie word (if you note it) but may be so vsed, and if it may be so taken, it is so one time or other. This multiplicitie of variously

taking words in Logicke is said, by who maketh the least, to be eight fold, for some make no end of multiplying the sortes of it, And vnder the name of Equiuocation or Analogie it much confoundeth all scholasticall learning. Now for the custome and vse of words there be manie things to be respected, as the varieties of times, and qualities of persõs, for in one time a word may signifie one thing, and in an other a quite different thing, So wee see that those who write of eloquence giue words their births and ould ages. And likewise who knowes not how great difference there is betwixt the vse of words in the Court or vniuersitie, or great cities, and the vse of the same

words in remoter parts and villages. Nay if you marke it you shall finde that as languages in generall are the institution of a multitude of men, so almost euerie particular man is Master, and as it were founder of some particular expressions or phrases not common to others, whereby some declare them selues more exactly and plainely, others more confusedly and ambiguously, in so much that Critickes, curious in antient Writings, Will attribute or derogate certaine workes from Authors vpon this only ground. And now I pray, cozen, in such an antient writing as the scripture is how manie ambiguities may grow from all these principles? Or rather what certaintie can be

had out of such multiplicitie of vncertitudes ? But let me particularly vrge one thing, that is, whether t'is possible that a language should be entirely conserued in written bookes, which still remaine the same?

How a lāguage is conserued.

Nephew. Why not ? if there be bookes enough, for then all the words of that language may be found in them, in all their senses, and then I thinke the language cannot perish.

Vncle. Your answere is partly true, but not sufficient, for you were to considere whether so manie bookes of one language may haue beene conserued. for if the Countrie be litle, few bookes will be written in the language, but if the language be dispersed

through manie Countries, it will haue it's proper words and significations for euerie Countrie. So that bookes being written for the subiects, and not for the language, (as Dictionaries and phrase bookes are) it must needes follow that only so much of the language will be conserued as is necessarie for the vnderstanding of those bookes, which of them selues are so good, as that the people will still desire to haue them and continue them. Wherefore nether all bookes that are written, nor, (if we iudge by these of our time anie notable part will be conserued, nor yet the whole language contained in all the bookes that are written. And if part of the language be lost, part

conserued, of necessitie the conserued part must be imperfect by the mistakeof such words as be rarely found, and where they are found, only gheſt at by the rest which are to make sense with them. And all this equiuocall ambiguitie is purely in the bare words, not yet placed in construction.

Nephew. I thinke so, vncle, for altough I see there be cases, numbers, moodes, tenses, and persons in euerie language, yet I hope those doe rather take awaie equiuocation then make it,

Vncle. It is true those things are made to take awaie equiuocation, but if you reflect you shall finde that the want of them, and the confused or

vnexact vse of them, doth likewise cause it, and where they are more aboundant (as in some languages) there the abuse of them is more frequent: people being in nothing more vnvarieth in their words; And where they are but rare and few, that likewise of it self causeth ambiguitie. And if you will looke into those particular languages wherein the scripture was primitiuely written, you shall finde that the Hebrew hath eight moodes wholy different from anie of ether the Greeke or Latin moodes, and euer varying the sense, as much as the actiue and passiue doe in Latin and Greeke. The Greekes haue seuen tenses all of different significations, and

of numbers, genders, persons three a peece. The Latin six cases. So that you see new occasions of Equiuocation almost in euerie word, and consequently what obscuritie and doubtfullnesse must of necessitie follow anie language or sense relying vpon words; and yet for breuitie sake, I haue not tould you the half of what the matter giueth me scope to saie, for the scripture dependeth and hath beene originally written in more languages then I haue spoken of, Where of some haue much more varietie then anie of those that I haue expressed. For cõstruction you may first conceiue that the verie pointing and accenting of words doth beget a number of doubts and

Equiuocations, a diuers *comma* or *virgula* making some times the sense quite different. Secondly, that word which is construed with an other to cleere the signification of it, is sometimes it selfe of no lesse ambiguitie then the other. Thirdly in the same construction it may happen that the same two words will haue diuers senses. And of all these your Grammer and Oratory Masters, doe enlarge their precepts. And aboue all there is an Equiuocation in the most commō words wee vse, rising out of a kinde of custome depending of particular times and places, which the compilers of the Ciuill law thought to be of so great importance as that they iudged it necessa-

rie to make a speciall booke *de vsu & interpretatione verborum*, and that for the commoneſt words that were inuſe. Theſe reaſons, being vnauoidable in anie language by humaninduſtrie, are more then ſufficient to let you ſee that t'is impoſſible to conuince and demonſtrate anie thing out of bare and dead words, and that who vndertakes ſuch a taſke doth not ſee what hee attempteth.

Nephew. If all theſe things bee true which you tell me I wonder with what face anie man can pretende to conuince pointes of controuerſies ſo clearely out of the ſcripture, which ſome doe with ſuch cõfidence, for ſurely they muſt ether be proude dunces, and

ignorant

ignorant doltes, not vnderstanding what is proofe and what is not, or else preuaricating miscreants counterfeiting what they doe not believe, and thinke our learned men vnable or vnwilling to discouer the follye of theyr enterprise.

Vncle. Your bloode is too hot, nephew, but if you said only, that such men as promise them selues victorie with so much confidence in this case, are rash and vnaduised, I should thinke you wronged them not. For the truth is, there's none but is so in his measure. And where interest or affection is ioyned to some litle apparēce, which the first sight of the text affordeth, there's presently a great impression

made. It is true in so graue and important a case they ought to be more staied, but he whose conscience quitteth him from all too forward iudging of his neighbours, euen in matters of consequence, let him cast the first stone for mee. I will leaue them to themselues, and let you see that we are not yet at an end but farther.

§. 9. *That there riseth an vncertaintie out of this that the Scripture was written in languages now ceassed.*

FOr not only the languages in which the Holy scripture was written, doe of their owne nature as I tould you, breede great ambiguitie in the text

but also in this, that those languages are now extinct. And therefore wee see that the knowledge of them is not cõmon ad vniuersall, but only of some particular men, and amongst them in most things mainely controuerted. And of this disputable vncertaintie amongst our famous linguists none can be ignorant, the nũber of Criticks in this age, and the multitude of their volumes giue sufficient testimonie of it. Nay they will tell you that an exact and skillfull knowledge in this Criticisme is a necessarie part and qualitie for all those who will professe the studie or interpretation of scripture. And yet God knowes vpon what slight grounds they proceed, what wea-

The vncertaintie of criticisme.

ke ghesses are their iudgmēts, how full of quarells, and mistakes, so that a wise man no sooner seeth them, but seeth likewise that there is nothing but varieties of disputs vpon coniecturall probabilities, and neuertheless, you shall haue thē cry out, runne to the fountaine, goe to the spring, see the originall texts, not considering that there is nothing there but troubled waters, that is, obscure cōiectures. I could tell you also that oftentimes it happeneth that such as are imployed in the translations of these ambiguous originalls, haue got by frieds and fauour that preferment, and so haue let passe some places in their trāslations (which I could cite) against their owne iudgment,

to complie with the will of their patrons, and higher powers, whom they durst not resiste. But in deede their principles in them selues are so vncertaine, as that the best and wisest of them will confesse they haue beene often mistaken and will not sticke to chãge their mindes now and then euen in such pointes as they thought they had the greatest euidence their art could afford them. What thinke you then, deare cozen, would become of Christian faith if it were only to relye vpon such a weake fundation? Which must needes follow, if the most substantiall pointes of Christian Religion must haue their only warrant and decision from the bare written

word, and bee euer agitated by places of scripture, and neuer concluded by a definitiue sentence. Were it not too tedious I would let you see the vncertaintie of diuers particalar languages wherein seuerall parts of the scripture are said to haue beene originally written, but I will only tell you in a word

§. 10. *What vncertaintie followeth the two particular languages of Hebrew and Greeke wherein the scripture was written.*

FIrst therefore the Hebrew hath two proprieties verie considerable, the one, that it is thought to be the shortest language in the world, the

other, that it is the most eloquent. For the first, it consisteth cheefely in the writing of the words, and in the scarcitie of bookes. For the writing, all the vowells are supposed, not expressed in the originall copies, and therefore only conserued by memorie, and to memory we must trust for them. I confesse they are now expressed by pointes, wherein there is great mistaking, the rules thereof being verie vncertaine, and the more in that these rules and the practize of them were varied according to the diuersitie of the countries wherein the Iewes haue beene dispersed. The reason of their writing without points I conceiue was, becaus their vowells being at the first

but fiue, by making long and short grew to be more; and so the first figures of them to stand only for the consonant vse of some vowells, or els to haue no sound. But what soeuer the origine was, the effect must of necessitie breede a great obscuritie and doubtfullneſſe in the language, the vowells though fewer yet in vſe being verie neere as much as the consonants. The words are all of one or two sillables, if anie be of more, they are accounted exoricke, and therefore verie like one an other, which is also increased by the neereneſſe of diuers of their letters. So that both their pronuntiation and writing being easily mistaken and confounded bring a great disorder in

the language. This is likewise augmented by the want they haue of coniunctions and prepositions, which not being of a sufficient number make the construction verie equiuocall manie times. For the scaretie of bookes, you may well conceiue it, if you doe but know that the legitimate Hebrew is wholy contained in the old scripture, whereof some parts were not written in Hebrew, and if you saw the booke in a smale print, and yet the letter bigger then our litle latin character, you would see it is but a verie litle booke. And what soeuer beside is written in Hebrew is not warrantable to explicate the text. The Rabins affecting manie diuersities as well in words and stile, as in

writing. Nay perhaps I might add to this, that the characters themselues haue beene wholy changed since the beginning, and that it is credibly reported to haue beene once lost and restored only by the memorie of Esdras. So that we haue the least assurance of this language that almost can be of anie not entirely extinguished. For the proprietie of the Hebrew's Eloquence it consisteth cheefely in figures, translations, and number. Figures or schemes are the higheſt part of proper Rhetoricke, because they contayne the greateſt force and swaye that words can giue to our appetit, and if they bee rightly applyed carrie away the auditor euen against his will vnto a strong

and disdaine action. These, although the Prophets vse them more perfectly then euer anie Poet or Orator did, yet doe they not cause much obscuritie, vnlesse it be when they are vsed in Dialogue forme, which where it is vsed in scripture, it is hard to discerne. How soeuer they are a conuincing proofe that who vseth them much intendes not his writings should be dogmaticall and decisiue. Translations or metaphores are cause of great obscuritie, and therefore we see the Poets who cheefely vse them, are not to be redd vntill a man be exercised in the) without studie and paines. Nor doe anie Greeke or Latin examples shew that strength which the scripture hath in this kinde.

The number or Cadence, which one would thinke could not be ſuſpected of anie ſuch matter, is a cauſe of great ambiguitie, for the Hebrews being wholy giuen thereunto in their ſcripture, haue ſo manie accents of diuers effects, whereof one manie times ſtanderh for an other, or is like an other in figure, that you had neede of an Ariadne to lead you thorough. Some of their accents are Grammaticall, ſome Rhetoricall, ſome muſicall, and as much a doe with them as with the reſte of the words, and verie hard it is to know when it is one accent, when it is an other, and when it hath this effect, when that. Who therefore would haue recourſe to the Hebrew Text for

precise and conuincing decisions, doth like him, that being not skillfull at his weapon, would choose, vpon a challenge, for the hower of his combat, a moonelesse midnight, when the skill of his enimie could not preiudice him.

Nephew. Marrie sir I thinke such a man should doe wisely, for the question being not of fencing but of valour, his enimies skill would be no disaduantage vnto him. But yet I cannot commende him that chooseth obscuritie for the decision of a doubt, vnlesse he feare his cause and thinke himself in the wrong, and then peraduenture his witt may be commended.

Vncle. It is sufficient for mee, that you conceiue that

this is not the way to cleere the truth. To the Greeke text therefore, which I will tell you, that the ambiguitie of it is nothing so great as of the Hebrew, yet hath it two defects. The one that it wanteth those sense-varying conjugations whereby the Orientall languages expresse them selues, the other that by abundance or rather redundance of vnprofitable varieties it is both hard to learne, and vncertaine in sese, the same word signifying diuersly, either because of diuers Dialectes, or of diuers applications of authours, so manie hauing written in seuerall countries, not depending one of an other, and hauing great diuersitie of phansies. Their prepositions

both in construction and composition are irregular, changing some times the sense of the primatiue verie extrauagantly, in so much that meere ghesse and coniecture must preuaille, the word, if it be cõmon, being vsed in sundrie seses, if it be rare, the meaning of it must be gathered out of some thing adiacent.

Neph. Here is enough, vncle, of this verball and Grãmaticall stuffe. Wherefore I will now put you in minde of your promise, to wit, that you will tell mee to what end the scripture was left to the church since by reason of it's ambiguitie it is not fit to be a judge of controuersies?

Vncle. I will tell you presently, but first I haue a word

more to saie vnto you, wherein, because I see you are half wearie, I wee wilbe short, and it shalbee to shew you

11. *That the verie nature of the bookes of scripture is not fitting to decide controuersies.*

TEll me then, cozen, suppose you were to giue a law in writing, which should last for manies ages, and be obserued in manie coũtries, how would you cause it to be written? I meane not for the language, but for the frame of the worke, and for the manner or methode of the deliuerie of it.

Nephew. I doe not professe my self able to bee a lawmaker, yet according to the example of our laws, and of

the cruell law, (and I imagine the like of the laws of other countries) it were me thinke's to be donne thus. I would first cause the most commō things to be commanded, then by degrees I would descende to particulars, still obseruing that seuerall matters should be vnder seuerall chapters or diuisions, and not one peece here, an other there, euerie chapter containing all things necessarily belonging to that matter. Farther I would distinguish the degrees of commandes by the degrees of penalues and rewards. And if anie thing were fit, partly to be declared, partly to be left to discretion, I would expresse so much that there might be no mistake. As for the stile, I would endeauour

In What forme lawes ought to be made

to make it the moſt proper and exact that poſſibly I could, explicating ambiguous words to my power, and declaring in what ſenſe they were to be taken, cutting of all ſuperfluous words which might anie waye confound or prolong the ſentences without neceſſitie. In fine I would labour to make it the moſt ordinarie, the moſt plaine, and the moſt short that my witts could reach vnto, and then according as I ſhould haue followed theſe rules I ſhould thinke to haue performed my taſke.

Vncle. I ſee you would make a good ſtates man, And if reaſon teach you this, will not the ſame reaſon tell you likewiſe, that if the Authour of reaſon him ſelf were to giue a

law, would he not doe the same, in a more perfect degree? And if in anie booke he hath not donne it; doth not the same reason tell you, that his intention was not, that *that booke* should be a iudging law? Let vs therefore see whether these conditions be obserued in the scripture or no, And if it be manifest that the scripture hath them not, this controuersie must needes be at an end, sithence it will euidently follow that God neuer ordained the scripture for anie such pourpose, but for something els, and consequently that it were as ridiculous to seeke the decision of controuersies out of scripture, as to cut with a beetle or knoke with a straw. Deuiding therefore it

The diuision of the bookes of the old Testamẽt.

holy scripture you shall finde, that the bookes of the old Testament (sauing Deuteronomie, which is, or containeth the old law, with much admixtion of historie) are ether Historicall, oratoricall, poeticall, or Philosophicall, Whereof the three first are excluded by their verie names from the qualities and conditions of a law instituted for the deciding of quarells, though some cõmandes may be therein contained vpon occasion. The philosophicall bookes are such as touch litle vpon our cõtrouersies, because they are but ether morall instructions for the life and conuersation of men amongst their neigbours, or else they treate and speake only of such poin-

tes as wee and all our Aduersaries agree in. But in deede there is a maine reason against the whole text of the old law, which is, that the commandes were giuen, as we saie, personally to one people and did no farther belong to the rest of the world then in that they were naturall commandes, that is in the vertue of nature obliging to obedience. So that who soeuer will argue out of the old Testament must first proue the commande to be naturall, which if he doe, hee needeth not produce the text for it. The new Testament is Historicall, Epistolar, or Mistical, which by their verie names and natures exclude all such exactnesse as of necessitie is required to a iudging

The diuision of the bookes of the new Testament.

law, they being all written vpō ſpeciall occaſions, and for particular ends, manie things repeated, manie things left out in one which are found in another, ſcarſely anie one knowing of an others writings. Thoſe things which are in the Hiſtorie and in the Epiſtles, are expreſſed as was fitting for the vnderſtanding of them to whō they were written, or to whom the recited ſpeech was made, circumſtances farr different to what is conuenient and accōmodated to our vnderſtandings now. And as an able mā ſaith of hiſtorie, that becauſe it muſt needes leane and rely vpon all circumſtances euen of ſmale moment, he that ſhould gouerne him ſelfe by it, muſt of neceſſitie be miſ-

lod: so in our case the want of knowing circumstances, and not comprehanding the true meaning of what was written in a particular occasion, must of necessitie make vs apt and subiect to take our aymie and rule amisse. The mistical booke which we call the Apocalips, being a pure Allegorie is the most vnfitting of all. This in my iudgment is so euident, that if anie man of common sense would but reflect and really considere what is requisite to determine a litigious controuersie betwixt two men passionate of their owne opinions he would neuer saie that scripture is a booke ether intended by Allmightie God, or anie waie fit for such a purpose. Besides a prudent and

experienced man will tell you, that who looketh in to the various dispositions of men's vnderstandings, but especially of men's wills, and seeth the varietie and multiplicitie of men's interests and passions, (which for the most part are publickly noted in euerie ma, or at least so inwardly hidden and secretly couered, that some times euen he who would and doth sweare and protest himself free from all such preoccupations, is neuertheless the most dangerously intangled) that such an one, I saie, will neuer thinke to finde two in two thousand who, left to their owne libertie, will agree in the interpretatio of anie law, how plane soeuer, where both are oppositly interressed. But

if

if wee put this law to be supernatural and Deuine, full of misticall and sublime commandes, whereunto nature hath not the least inckling whereby to raise hir self to the knowledge thereof, but must of necessitie wholy and precisely rely vpon authoritie and captiuate hir vnderstanding *in obsequium fidei*, and this to the most obscure and darke points and articles that can be imagined, shall wee saie, that in this case, euerie one is to gather this law, and come to the knowledge of it, as well as he can out of the scripture alone, so full of infinite ambiguitie as you haue seene? Were it not first to be proued that scripture was made and intended for this end:

which how possible it is to performe, let anie indifferent man iudge. Whereas to remitte the iudgment of all quarells, disputes and controuersies of Religiō vnto liuing men, is more efficacious, more suitable to nature and discretion, and in a word conformable to the practize of our forefathers, and to the principles of common sense and reason.

Nephew. I must confesse I shall neuer thinke scripture was giuen for a iudge of controuersies. For to make so large a booke, and to mingle in it so manie things which ether apperteine not at all to the substance of our beliefe, or be verie remotely cōnexed vnto it, And then to leaue it to our ghessing what may be the

meaning of the words, doth plainely argue some other intention in the writer then to set downe a standing and authenticall text to decide quarrells. And although I heare, the Protestants saie, that a plaine passage cleareth an obscure, so may it be said, that an obscure passage darkeneth a cleere, so that's all one. Wherefore I long to know for what vse the scripture was made.

Vncle. Haue yet a little patience, cozen, and make a reflexion vpon some cheefe points which haue beene controuerted in the church of God. As by the Arrians how a spirituall and indiuisible essence, such as God is, could haue a natural sonne. By the Trinitarians and Sabellians how the

Diuers substantiall points haue beene opposed by antient Heretickes.

same indiuisible thing could bee three persons. By the Nestorians and Eutychians how one person could subsiste in two natures. By the Pelagians how God's foreknowledge and predestinatiō could stand with merits and freewill. By the Iconoclasts how the adoration of Images tended and ended in the Archetype. By the Berangarians how a naturall bodie can haue corporall presence otherwise then by it's quantitie. By our Wicklefists how all things be not gouerned by a fatall necessitie, And all these renewed by the libertie and confusion of our lasbages. Considere the subtilitie of these questions, how they are a boue nature and aboue our comprehensiō,

how the truths of theſe diſputes are like the paſſage betwixt Scylla and Charybdis, limited betwixt two errours ſo narrowly as that when they are ſpoken of at large and not dogmatically, (ſpecially before they be examined and before the ſpeaker by miſtruſt of oppoſition is made warie) it is almoſt impoſſible the ſpeaker ſhould be ſo iuſt and ſtraight in his language, as not to giue occaſion to one who comes after him, to pretende his fauour for the one or the other errour. Conſidere farther that wrangling witts (ſuch as for the moſt part they are who firſt beginne a new factio in the church) haue this property, that they reduce their queſtions by litle and litle to

logicall and abstracted notiõs, and force the Catholikes to follow them, if they will not desert their antient truths, so that after a while one knoweth not where the controuersie lyeth. For example Simon Magus, and the first authours of our last Breaches, preached *that faith did so iustifie as that good workes were not necessarie*, now their followers draw the question to this *whether faith or charitie be the forme of iustification*, which is all most pure Logicke. Now if an Arrian come and tell you that the scripture saith, *Pater maior me est*, and therefore that Christ Iesus was not truly God nor consubstantiall to his father? And the like may be said of the rest of these he-

reſies and euen of all the moſt
ſubſtantiall and fundamentall
points of Chriſtian faith) The
Catholike maintaine's the cō-
tratie, now, I ſaie, is it poſſible
that anie rationall man ſhould
thinke that theſe and the like
queſtions can be diffinitiuely
reſolued by a critical libratiō
of dead and vncertaine words
full of equiuocall ambiguitie,
their ſenſe and meaning lying
in the breſt and minde of him
who is not to be found, but de-
ceaſſed manie ages agone?
And if they cannot (as it is
more then euident they can-
not) ſhall wee thinke that
Chriſt Ieſus hath left and eſta-
bliſhed no meanes or autho-
ritie vpon earth to take vp
theſe quarells and decide the-
ſe controuerſies: ſhall matters

of such maine importance and great consequence euer remaine a perpetuall subiect of endlesse dissention and diuision? shall the Catholike church and Christian Religion bee torne and rente in peeces euē in what is most substātiall and essentiall in hir (for still, I saie the like may be said of what pointe soeuer) at the will and pleasure of some priuate mē's phansies, and no power ordained to preuent such essentiall and eternall disorders? If this be not to ruine ād ouerthrow all gouerment and Religion, and to introduce confusion both common sense and reasō faileth. Put this libertie, (of beleeuing only what he thinkes he find's in the scripture) but in to one man's hands, to

wit, the first beginner and brocher of a new dogme, and let him be a man to whom the sharpenesse of wit, and some times a seeming good life, hath giuen authoritie (though truly his spirit is gouerned ether by a secret pride, or by some other interest or indignation) and see if such an one be not able to draw a great multitude, euen *the third part of the starrs* after him, especially if he preach libertie ether of minde or bodie, and haue with all the hand of some Prince full of rewards and punishments to second his motions, Calculate what the industrie of such a formed party hartily cleauing together is not able to inuente. Some haue been able to cast mistes euen

vpon mathematikes, and vpō the most certaine principles of nature, and laying then those qualities of scripture, which I haue tould you of, to the disposition of those factious persons, what euidence thinke you can be expected from the conflicts of such men disputing vpon such grounds?

Nephew. Trouble your self no farther in this poinct, for I cannot but confesse that the euidence you haue brought is greater then I could expect or desire. Wherefore I pray hold me no longer in suspence, but tell mee

§. 12. *Which be the wayes or manners of iudging poinctes of Religiō out of the scripture.*

Vncle. Why, cozen, tell

me first, doe you see the walle before you, some fouer or fiue yards frō you? and how much of it doe you see?

Nephew. I see it perfectly well, God be thanked, and it is white, there is fower pictures hangs on it, and half a douzen chaires stand against it, To tell you precisely how much of it I see together, that I perhapps cannot, but in a short turning of myne eye I can see it all, or verie neare, if I will.

Vncle. I pray goe within a spanne of it and then tell mee what difference you finde in the sight of the walle.

Nephew. Marry I finde now that I see much lesse of it, but that which I doe see, and which lyeth directly before me, I see farr better and can distinguish

euerie litle part in it, and of what collour it is.

Uncle. Did you not tell mee, cozen, the walle was white? how cometh it to passe that you tell me now you see what collour euerie part of it is?

Nephew. It seemed all white before whilest I was a good waie from it, but when I came neere it, I could perceiue some litle parts dunne, others browne, and the like, but soe the white parts were much more.

Uncle. Why then, cozen, you may thinke that you did not perfectly see the collour of the walle before, for the collour of the walle must needes be the collour of the parts, and you saie the collour of the parts is not one but manie, and therefore you only saw the

colour of those parts which did exceede the rest. And if you tooke anie of those litle parts and put it in a multiplying glasse, you would see as great difference of parts, and peraduenture of colours to, in it, as you saw in the walle when you were within a spanne of it: for that if one should aske you what you haue seene, you would hardly quit your self handsomly of the question. Notwithstanding you perceiue well enough that the first sight of the walle serueth you for all the vses of your life; as not to runne against it, and generally to know how to comporte your self or vse anie thing else which were requisite to be set towards the walle or in anie manner to be donne

about it. The second sight serueth you only to know the nature of the walle, and to distinguish what is mixed in it, or of what ingredients it is compofed, or the like. So that you see the easier and more common knowledge of anie thing serueth for the direction of our lines, the more particular and exact knowledge is only required either for the content of the knower, or for some speciall practize vpon the thing knowne.

Nephew. I believe I vnderstand already which waie you intende to carrie me, for you will tell me that there are two manners of vnderstãding scripture, the one a Kinde of large manner, taking it in grosse and a great deale togeather,

as we take a discourse or playe which pleasingly passeth away without anie great demurr, or particular weighing of euerie word. The other more curious and exact looking into euerie litle proprietie which may breede anie diuersitie. And I suppose you would tell me that this second belõgeth only to scholliers, but that the former guideth our life and gouerneth our actions. And tis true I see the people is ordinarily caried awaye by their preachers, Antient common wealths by their Oratours, and in what matter soeuer an eloquent and elaborate discours which passeth sweetly in this sort gaine's presently the suffrages of the Auditorie. Wherefore I must needes confesse

that what good effect soeuer is the end for which the scripture was ordained, if it be anie thing belonging to mans life and conuersation, it must be compassed by this grosse, cō-mon, and ordinarie course of reading and vnderstanding it. Whereas if a man should ouer examine euerie word he would not finde grounde to fixe himself with aduantage and vilitie. Is not this your meaning?

Vncle. You are verie right. And surely if we looke into what is in the scripture necessarie for our good life and vertuous conuersation, we shall finde plainely that it is to be had this waie. As the direction of our liues and actions to God, acknowledging all things from him, Comfort in

aduerſitie, moderation in proſperitie, compaſſion of the afflicted, helping of the needie, Rewards of vertue, punishments of vice, examples of both, and in a word the motiues of the loue of God and our neighbour, and of the contempt of the world. Who therefore is ſo blinde as not to ſee that theſe things are to be found in the ſcripture by a ſenſible, common, and diſcreet reading of it; though perhapps by a rigorous and exact ballancing of euerie particular word and ſyllable, anie of theſe things would vaniſh awaie we know not how? but to come yet cloſſer to our pourpoſe, doe you thinke this manner of reading ſcripture would make a man a perfect belee-

uer that is a Catholike? Which is as much as to aske

How scripture doth determine controuersies?

§. 13. NEPHEW. How should I know that, vnlesse I were able to proue my Religiõ out of scripture, or at least that I were able to giue a iudgement of all that is in scripture? Which is beyond my capacitie.

Vncle. Then I will tell you, cozẽ, there are two meanes to make one a Catholike or a true and perfect beliuer. The one by shewing euerie point of our faith in particular. And this I dare not saie that our common and ordinarie manner of reading or hearing

scripture is able to doe, for we see those who write of controuersies doe alledge but few places, nor those vnauoidable neither, for some pointes of Catholike doctrine. Nor is it to be expected, Because man's nature being euer to add to what is already learned, And seeing likewise that long practise maketh men perfect in all arts, There being no prohibitiō to perfect in some sort the instruction of the faithfull, the œconomie of the church, and some such other things, which the oppressed Primitiue church could not bring to perfectiō, no maruell I saie if these and the like things can not in particular be shewd in the scripture; but shall therefore I know not

who rise vp and exclame these things be superstitious, hurtfull to the faithfull ad make a schisme to destroy them? Who doth not see that this were plaine faction and Rebellion? The other meanes or waye to make one a Catholike is by some common principle; as if by reading of scripture wee finde nothing contrarie to the Catholike tenet or practize which our Aduersarie call in question: or also if wee finde it commẽded there in generall, or the authours and obseruers of it praised and extolled. And in this waye I doubt not but a sensible and discreete reading of scripture at large, may and will make anie true student of it, a perfect beleeuing Catholike, so he proceede with indif-

ferecie, and with a minde rather to know ſcripture then to looke for this or that poinct in it. But now can you tell me, cozē, how it cometh to paſſe that ſithence by an exact and particular examinatiō of the words of ſcripture theſe truths cānot be conuinced and beaten out of it, how, I ſaie, is it poſſible that by a common and ordinarie reading of it theſe truths ſhould appeare, for that cānot be in the ſumme, which is not in the particulars.

Nephew. I can tell you that there is the ſame difficultie in the diuers ſights of the walle, which you made me experiēce but euen now, but to yeild you a good reaſon ether of the one or the other, that paſſeth my vnderſtanding.

Vncle. Haue you not seene an inuention of the Architects, who can so dispose pillars in a gallerie that setting your eye in a certaine position you shall see the figure of a mā or a beast, and walking a long the gallerie to goe to it, it vanisheth awaie and you shall see nothing but pillars? Or haue not seene a silinder or pillar of glasse, before which if you laie certaine papers full of scrawolles and scrables and looking into the pillar you shall see the picture of a man, or the like? As these are dōne so it happeneth in our case, both in the eye and in the vnderstanding. For the art of these things is, that certaine parts may so come together to the eye, as that other parts ether by situation,

or by some other accident, remaine hidden, and that those parts which appeare being seene without the others, will make this or that shape. In our case likewise the quantitie of the seene parts, exceeding the vnseene keepes the whole possession of the eye, in the sight, and of the vnderstanding in reading, not letting the reste appeare. And hence it is also, that this common manner of vsing scripture is more secure then the exact ballancing of it. For neither the varietie of translations, nor the errours of copies, nor the difficulties of languages, nor the mutabilitie of words, nor the multiplicitie of the occasions and intentions of the writers, nor the abundance of

the things written, nor the different framinges of the bookes, which be the causes of vncertaintie in a rigorous examinatiō, haue anie such power as to breake the common and ordinarie sense or intention of the writer in generall, as all bookes testifie vnto vs. And hence it is likewise, that the holy fathers, presſed scripture against the Heretickes of their times, partly forced thereunto becauſe the Heretickes generally will admitte of no proofe but out of the scripture; but cheefly by reason their workes are diffuſe and oratorical, befitting people vſed to orations and sermons, as the Greekes and Romans were, diuers of the fathers themselues bredd in that sort of learning,

ning. Wherefore you shall haue them cite manie places, some proper, some Allegoricall, some common, all, some times, auoidable if they be taken seperatly, but the whole discours more or lesse forcible according to the naturall parts or heauenly light more or lesse communicated to one then to an other, yet still in the proportion of oratours who speake to the multitude and not to Socrates or Crysippus. Wherefore the scripture in this kinde was a fitting weapon for them, and the churche's continuing and remaining in their doctrine sheweth that they vsed it dexterously, and as it ought to be vsed with relation and dependance of tradition.

Nephew. Why then, sir, must all disputatiō of Religiō out of scripture be abolished? For if there can bee no certaintie gathered out of it in a decisiue & definitiue waie, to what purpose should a man either alledge it, or admitte it in disputes of Religion? at least tell me I pray

§. 14 *What laws are requisite for disputation out of scripture?*

Vncle. I am farr frō disliking disputation out of scripture, so it be donne with those conditions which are fitting, and which may bring the matter to some vpshott. The first rule I would haue a Catholike obserue is, not to dispute with a Protestāt,

vnleſſe he promiſe to proue his poſition euidently and manifeſtly. For ſince the Catholike knowes there may be certaine wittie probabilities and hard places of ſcripture brought againſt him, it were madneſſe in him to leaue his tenet, cuſtome [*optima legum interpres*) ſtāding for him, and the practize of the church being on his ſide, which is the greateſt argument that can be brought to shew how and in what sēſe the ſcriptures, which that church hir ſelf deliuereth, are to be vnderſtood, it were, I ſaie, meere follie in a Catholike to leaue his *tenent* and accept of an other only for a probable and likely interpretation, his owne being confirmed by that practize which

maketh it more then probable. And it is cleere, the Protestant must needes pleade against possession, for at the first breaking when the Protestants pretended to reforme the church, she was surely in possession of those things which they pretended to take awaie, and in possession of that sense of the scripture which they pretẽded to be false and wrõg. And surely no man of common sense who is in possessiõ, and hath the law in his owne hands, will yeild it vp without euidence on the cõtrarie part. The second rule I desire a Catholike should obserue is, not to thinke his cause lost because him self cannot answere the argumẽts proposed against him, nor to venter his cause and his

possession vpon his owne wit. For the disputation being in a matter wherein, according to the Protestants groundes, there is no certaintie, it followeth that who hath the better wit, or is more practized in this matter, may bring an argumēt a good scholler cannot solue at the first sight, though afterwards either he or some other may. And what a follie were it for a man to venture his soule and conscience vpon a subtilitie or present flash of wit, whereof peraduenture within an hower hee him selfe will see the falsitie, and condemne his owne errour. Wherefore a Catholike is not to venter the cause vpon his owne head, not to confesse it weake because he cannot defende it, for

both may he improue him ſelfe, and ſome others perhapps may goe farr beyõd him. The third rule is, that the Catholike should neuer vndertake to conuince his Aduerſarie out of ſcripture, but content him ſelf that theſe words may well beare thi ſenſe, which is in fauour of the Catholike church, And this is both more eaſie to performe and ſufficient for his pourpoſe. For the Catholike hath an aſſured grounde of his faith beſides ſcripture, and which relyeth not vpon it, nay he holdeth that his Religion cannot be wholy conuinced out of ſcripture, to what end therefore, (vnleſſe he would show his wit) should he vndertake to proue his *tenents*, by ſcripture? For this were to

ſtrenghen his opponent in his owne grounde and principle, to wit, that all is to be proued out of ſcripture.

Nephew. You would binde Proteſtants to verie vnequall conditions, if you will oblige them to conuince, and the Catholike not, nay that it shalbe ſufficient for the Catholike to shew this may be the meaning of this or that place of ſcripture, whereas the Proteſtant shalbe forced to proue cleerely and euidently that this is the verie ſenſe of the text.

Vncle. Not I, cozen, but the Proteſtants them ſelues oblige thē ſelues to this hard meaſure, for if a man should ſtrongly mātaine that a Beetle were the beſt inſtrument, to cut withall, and you ſaie no,

were no he bound to cut with a Beetle, and it were no ſenſe, to ſaie, that you should be forced to doe it, ſince you maintaine it to be impoſſible. So they who hold that the ſcripture is the true iudge of controuerſies, and fit and able to decide all quarells and diſſenſions about the Chriſtian faith and law, binde them ſelues, by holding this, to conuince their poſitions by ſcripture, which cānot be exacted at his hands, Who ſaith ſcripture was not made for this end, nor is ſufficient for it. And looke vpon Luther and the Heretikes of his timē, nay vpon the Puritants of our days, and ſee if they doe not all mātaine, that they can conuince their *tenēts* by ſcripture, and ſaie that our

forefathers were wholy ignorant of scripture, and that wee now liuing knowe nothing of it. But to goe on with our rules of disputing out of scripture. The fourth condition shall bee that the Catholike doe not admitte anie negatiue proofes, as to saie, this is an errour becauſe you can shew no scripture for it. For *this* is no proofe vnleſſe they will suppoſe that nothing is true but scripture, or that there is nothing to bee donne but what is ordained by scripture, which were absurd, for nether Catholike, nor, I thinke, anie good Protestant will admitte of that suppoſition, being it were not only to take away the power of the church, but euen nature from nature, for nature

teacheth vs to helpe our selues where scripture doth not contradict, and as a Puritant seeketh a pulpit or high place to preach in, without looking whether he haue a warrant for it in the scripture to command him, so rationall and sensible men doe seeke a particular habit for a preacher or Clergie man whereby he may be more decent and comely, and his words and exhortations be receiued with more respect and authoritie, and this without anie cõmande of the scripture, which, where it commandeth, it maketh the thing cõmanded, to be necessarie, where it is silent, there it maketh nothing vnlawfull.

Nephew. If the Protestants were to disput vpon these con-

ditions they would keepe of I warrant you. Yet this I must tell you, that it were a great satisfaction for indifferent men, that haue beene brought vp in this verball and apparent respect of the scripture, to see that the positions you would induce them vnto, can bee and are maintened by scripture, and that they are grounded therein. This perhapps you can doe by shewing mee some other waie of dealing with thē, and whether there be not

An other manner of disputing out of scripture. §. 15.

VNcle. For their sakes, cozen, I will tell you of an other sort of disputation, wherein the Protestant shall haue no other disaduantage but of his cause. For I thinke that the

Catholike cause may not only be maintened by scripture, but also that it hath the better stā-ding precisely to scripture alone. I confesse this kinde of disputation is not fit for manie Auditors, but only for mode-rate and vnderstanding men. And it is to make this, the que-stion. *Whether partie is more probable if only scripture were to bee alleadged.* This Question requireth diuers supposi-tions where vpon both sides are to be agreed, which I feare will bee some what hard. As what texts are to preuaille, what cō-mentaries or explicatiōs shall be allowed of, what is a pro-per and an improper speeche, amongst improper speeches which must be preferred, what copies of euerie text

shalbe held for good, what coniectures shall be accounted null against the naturall sense, And manie other such positions which would not be easily resolued. This donne let both sides bring their places for the pointe in question, and so the disputatiō will only be of the qualificatiō of the places, that is, to shew whether are more apparēt and likely of the two. And for this I see lekewise that so manie logicall principles are first to bee resolued, which partly are found as yet amongst the critickes disputations, as that all the Logickes hitherto inuented would not afford sufficiēt light and instruction, to make an euident conclusion, whether side were more apparent in

words and Tetxs. And therefore you may gheſſe how farr theſe diſputations out of ſcripture are frō clearing doubts, what litle good cometh of them, vnleſſe they bee well gouerned, And how for the moſt part the beſt credit or the beſt tongue carrieth awaie the day by the Auditor's preiudicat opinion or weakneſſe. In a word the ſcripture being not written for this end, to wit, for the deciſion of controuerſies, it is not to bee expected that it ſhould bee, of it ſelfe, without the churche's authoritie much profitable for that pourpoſe, but to informe our liues by an ordinarie reading of it, or by preaching, ſinging, and ſuch like vſes, things recommended in the verie letter

it ſelf, whereas wee are neuer ſēt to the word for the deciding of controuerſies. And now I hope you are fully ſatisfied.

Nephew. I am ſo in deede, and giue you manie thankes, for I ſee that how few pointes ſoeuer the Proteſtants pretende to be neceſſarie, yet cā there not anie thing be conuinced out of bare words inuoluing ſoe manie vncertainties as you haue tould me of.

Vncle. It is to litle pourpoſe for them to ſaie that ſome few ſubſtātiall and neceſſarie pointes may bee proued out of ſcripture, it were fitter they would firſt proue that the ſcripture is an inſtrument made to determine controuerſies, or anie other of thoſe principles, which I shewd you muſt of

neceſſitie be true, if ſcripture bee our rule. But this they can neuer proue, And therefore they ſeeke firſt to withdraw, vs from a ſecure and naturall meanes of relying vpon our forefathers, (Which neuertheleſſe in all ciuill and œconomicall conuerſation they themſelues can not liue without) and then to leaue vs to a labyrinth of voluntary and vnendable diſputations. Reflect then I pray, cozen, vpon what wee haue ſaid, and compare our yeſternight's and this our morning's diſcourſe together, conſidering firſt how manie things are of neceſſitie to bee conſerued in the church for the preſeruation of faith and good life in hir ſubiects: Then ſee how manie pointes haue

beene and are quarelled, and if anie haue escaped, how all the rest may be caled in question with as much probabilitie and apparence as these are, Then looke vpon the qualities of that *Decider of controuersies* where vnto all the Aduersaries of the Catholike church doe seeke to draw vs, by which there can be no other end of controuersies but to leaue euerie man to his owne will. And then conclude that these positions being put, there will nether remaine gouerment in the church, nor certaintie or constancie in beliefe, nor anie thing to be taught and practized worthie God Allmightie's sending of a lawgiuer, much-lesse of sending his owne sonne vpon those hard conditiõs

which wee apprehẽde of Iesus Christ and reade in the Ghospell.

Nephew. It is verie true but if your leaue mee thus I shall bee like him who had fatgot his *Pater noster* but not learned his *Our father*. For you haue taught mee what I cannot rely vpon, but not what I ought to rely vpon, And there is so much said against the authoritie of the church by all hir Aduersaries, that a man who hath beene euer beaten to those obiections, cannot easily leaue them without some scrupule.

Vncle. You are in the right, the most necessarie part is yet behinde, for a litle building is better then a great deale of pulling downe. Therefore when your leisure serueth you

I will bee readie to giue you satisfaction to the best of my power. But now this morning is too farr spent to beginne so large a discourse as that question doth require, Take an other time, and the sooner the more welcome, But for the present God be with you, I haue some prayers to saye.

THE THIRD DIALOGVE.

By what meanes Controuersies in Religion may be ended.

This Dialogue containeth 15. parts or paragraphes.

1. *THe Preface or Introduction.*
2. *What force the arguments of Protestants against Catholikes ought to haue?*
3. *That standing in likelyhood the Catholike partie is greater, more learned, and more vertuous.*
4. *Of what efficacitie is this argumẽt?*
5. *That it is no hard matter that Christ's Law should haue descẽded entire vnto vs.*
6. *That if Christ's law could haue beene conserued, it hath beene conserued*
7. *That no great errour could creepe*

in to the church of God.

8. That the truth of the Catholike doctrine hath continued in the church.

9. That the dissention of Catholike Doctours cõcerning the rule of faith doth not hurt the certaintie of tradition.

10. That the teaching of Christian doctrine without determining what of necessitie is to be believed and what not, hurtẽ s not the progresse of tradition.

11. That no errour can passe vniuersally through the church of God.

12. That these precedente discourses beare an absolute certaintie.

13. Some obiections are solued.

14. The Examples of traditions which seeme to haue failed are examined.

15. The conclusion of the whole discourse.

§. 1. *The Introduction.*

NEPHEW. I am come, vncle, to challenge you of your promiſe, for I cannot be quiet vntill you haue ſetled me in this ſo weightie a matter. If the pointes which are in cõtrouerſie be as you ſaie, and as you haue clearly shewd me, of great conſequence, and that by ſcripture we cannot decide them againſt contentious mẽ, I ſee that ether wee muſt ſeeke ſome other meanes, or els all Religion wilbee confounded, and the truth of Chriſt's law vnknowne and neglected. Wherefore I pray (if you can) giue mee a ſtrong reſolution in this point.

Vncle. Why, nephew, if this ſer-

uour continue you will not neede be a ſcholler but for a yeare, and a day, I pray you cõſidere it is a faire daie, and you neuer want imployment for the afternoones when the wether's faire, if I should ſtaie you now, you would perhapps ſo repent it, that I should not, I feare, ſee you againe this month, be not ſo greedie as to take a ſurfeite.

Nephew. I feare my owne inconſtancie and therefore I pray refuſe me not, diſcontinuance may breede coaldneſſe, ſpecially if what you haue alreadie taught me should bee ſullyed with worſe thoughts, and then I should not be ſo capable of your inſtructions as I hope I am at this preſent, Which I haue good reaſon to make great eſteeme of.

Vinde. Well if you will haue it so; you must giue me leaue to trench vpon a good part of your Afternoone, for I may bee long in this point, and I would be loath to breake off in the midle. Yet I will bee as shorte as possibly I can. Tell me then, had Iesus Christ euer a church or no? And I would haue you answere me, what you thinke a iudicious Protestant would saie to the same demande.

Nephew. I doubt not but anie Protestant of them all would answere you, that at least in the Apostles time Christ had a visible church, cõsisting of the faithfull which adhered to the Apostles and such Bishopps as were made by them; but that since that

time

time) is fallen into grosse errours, and chiefly Apostated from the true doctrine of Christ, or at least so deformed it, that a reformation was necessarie taken in pointes of beliefe. And this reformed their forefathers vnder colour. You are likewise perswaded, I suppose, (sayeth he) by the same euidence, that in the Apostles time *this church* was in communion with the particular church of Rome and therefore I will goe a little further and aske you, whether you doe not thinke, that this church, whereof the particular church of Rome was a part (and peraduenture the principall part) was not to be obeyed by euerie particular man and euerie particular church, she

being the whole they but mi-
bers of pains. She having re-
ceiued Christs doctrine, and
therefore able to teach it, &
having receiued the Keyes of
heauen, and therefore who re-
fused to heare her should be esteé-
med as a brother an Publican.
And in a word she being the
spouse of Iesus Christ, and the
mother of his faithfull chil-
dren.

Nephew. All this is so euident
that I thinke neither Prote-
stant nor Puritane will deny it.
But what doe you draw out
of this?

Vncle. Nay softly, cozen,
I must aske you one question
more before I conclude anie
thing, and it is, What became
of this church when it fell frō
Christ? I meane, were the men

and their gouernors so dainly exiled, and others raised in their places, or did there still continue a publicke face and sucessiue gouernment of the same church euen in their errors, and so the externall church remained and descended to our days, though with corrupt faith and doctrine?

Nephew. This I doubt not likewise but euerie one will grant you, for all the Protestants that euer I heard doe acknowledge it, nor doe I imagine that anie will deny it.

Vncle. Why then, cozen, wee will draw this conclusion, that, *That church* which is now in communion with the particular church of Rome, was once the true church, or if you please to saie, she was but a

part of the true church, so let it be, at least she had the true faith and doctrine, and euery particular man or church within his owne compasse was obliged to obey him, as hauing those worthie titles which you acknowledge euen now to bee then due vnto him. But now if a Protestant telleth you, shee hath since fallen and lost those goodly titles, How would you conuince him? or at least can you tell me

§. 2. *What force the arguments of Protestants against Catholikes in this question may haue.*

NEphew, To conuince a Protestant in this point I would haue recourse to do-

ches and learned men, who should maintaine and shew that his positions were false, for I am not so well learned as to bee able to proue it of my

Eudox. I hold you not for euenie gamester at this play, for why would you leaue your best ward and put your self vpon the disaduantage? I meane why will you put your self to proue the negatiue, your aduersarie being obliged to conuince the positiue? for the truth is, as he doth, our church was once the true church, we haue the presumption on our side, vntil he proue the contrarie. Besides our church was once the *spouse of Christ* by their owne verdict, though now the file hir the *whore of*

Babilon, Errorum, and Antichristi. And how I pray you, cozen, would your self take it, if one should laye the like imputation vpon your bedfellow without sufficient proofe to make it goode? And imagine Christ Iesus will be no lesse offended to see his deare spouse, who he bought and washed with his owne harts blood, so shamefully traduced without a legitimate cause and iust occasion. Doe you thinke hee will not brand such accusors for infamous and sacrilegious calumniators? Or if such an accusor should faille of his proofe, doth he not conuict him self of the most heynous crime that can be imagined? And likewise if this same church was erected and insti-

ained by God himself for our
lawfull Ladie and true Gouer-
nesse, can you thinke that she
can both from the loyaltie
and obedience due vnto him,
without euident proofe of his
defect from that throne and
dignitie, doth not declare him
self a traytor and rebell to
God and her? And in a word if
she once were *that church* to
whom Christ gaue the rouls
of iustice, and sent all profes-
sours of his name to heare his
voice and sentence vnder pe-
naine of being reputed as Pa-
gans and publicans, doth not
hee incurre those curses and
defame those dignominious ti-
tles, who doth leaue his lawfull gui-
dance him self from him without
legall warrant of his separatiõ?
Doth not therefore common

sense conclude, that whosoeuer confesseth the Romane Catholike church to haue been the true & lawfull church of Christ, is by this verse dr. ede obliged to proue cleerely and euidently him self from that quietie, or els in his owne conscience and iudgmen o must needes be lyable to those faule and vnwonhie taintes of mayson and rebellion against God and his church.

Nephew. I confesse you speake no parables, nor is there anie deepe learning required to conceiue the euidence of your discourse. Yet this I must tell you that if eare you might haue spared your labour, for there's no protestant but will easily vndertake to proue that the

Roma church is gone altraie,
for if they cannot doe this
they can doe nothing, when
their Religion being but as
they themselues confesse, a ta-
king away of abuses creepin,
and their Diuinitie no other
then to shew this. And if you
would shew their proofes to
be insufficient, I feare you
would require a greater scholler
then my self to comprehende your reasons.

Pyndar. Bee not discouraged,
Philo, but looke into the cause
and tell mee what kinde of
proofes you thinke the Pro-
testantes are bound to bring to
proue themselues from those
heauie censures I could rea-
son. Doe you thinke it were
sufficient to bring such ar-
guments as some philosophers

brought to proue snow to be blacker. Or such as by mans wit and the art of topickes, a good logician may frame vpo a subiect giuen him? in which kinde some great men haue taken pleasure to commende baldnesse, blindnesse, and the like imperfections, others to contradict manifest truths, as that there neuer was anie warre of Troy. Nay doe you thinke, cozen, it is sufficient that their arguments bee only as good as those which the Catholikes bring against them? Or in a word ought not their arguments to bee *euident* and *vnanswerable* in the eie of indifferent and vnderstanding mans iudgment? That is, should they not be such, as that a man expert in controuersies and of a

sound and vnpassionate iudgment, hauing seene what the most learned Catholikes can saie against the protestants proofes, must neuertheles thinke in his hart that they nether haue giue nor can giue anie contenting and satisfactorie answere there vnto?

Nouv. The plaine truth is, if it were my case betwixt my wife and my self, I should not thinke to haue corresponded with my loyaltie towards her, nor with that care of hir honnour which I ought to haue, vntill I had ventured my life to haue his harts blood who should haue sought to wronge hir reputatiō so highly, vnlesse such proofe as you require. Nether doe I beleeue that anie Prince or state would

thinke him a loyall subiect, who should conceale and suffer that maine that should disparke and ouerwhelme the liues of their subiects, the like suspicions against their gouernor. It is true I should be willing to beare of my wiues misdemainours before they come to that height and euidence, for mine owne interest, which God forbid, she should proue vnchaste. But there is a great difference betwixt giuing warning of likelyhoods and apparences of a mischeefe, whereby it may be preuented, and blemishing or staining my wiues and myne owne honour with the deepest disgrace that can fall vpon such an individuall couple. Besides I know the bond of loue and duue

IV. §

betwixt man and wife to be so great, as that no humane prudent ought not to put his confidence vpon so strong a knot, the greater and harder effect must haue a more powerfull cause: and it were a folly to make all proofes sufficient and beseeming all cases. And in my minde the reason is, because no amitie nor fidelitie can subsiste, if such principles were suffered to be taught and maintained. For how is it possible (humane accidents of themselues being intricate and variable, and men now adays so wittie to doo harme and mischeefe) but that euerie false tongue shall set dissention betwixt the neerest and dearest couples? And mutinie and stir vp to sedition the most faithi-

full subiects against their Prince, if lesse then mortall euidence be sufficient to proue matters of this nature and qualitie? Wherefore I doe not thinke his Maiestie would suffer his preachers to draw their Pedigree from Rome, if he did not perswade him selfe, they were able to bring satisfactorie proofes of their relinquishing that authoritie, for this were to authorize a Rebellion against the court and state of conscience. Which hath a greater force and power then pure temporall Allegiance, as being grounded vpon oath and duetie both which receiue their streng, hand vertue from conscience. If therefore you wil de to giue me full satisfaction in this pointe, you must cleere

rely shewe vnto me that the Protestants proofes are insufficient. Which though I doubt not of it, seeing our men haue euer beene so readie to buckle with the Protestants euen vpo most disdeuaniogious conclusions, yet I conclude that this cannot be otherwise effected then by experience, bringing them to dispute together.

Deare cosen I am hartily glad to heare you discourse so stronglye and solidly, it giues me great hopes of your future abilities. But if you will haue patience, your self shall be iudge of my question, nor doe I thinke it needefull to haue recours to anie further learning then common sense and naturall reaso, till therefore let vs see whether

§. 3. standing, in the hands of the partie, more learned, and more

Suppose then you had a cause in law of great difficultie, and that you should consult in Councell a dozen or twentie lawyers reputed the best of the Realme, or at least the worst of them far beyond your skill to judge whether he were not able as the best. And of these twentie, seuenteene or eighteene of them should faile, you would iudge by odds you could not chuse such or such councellour, the other 2. or 3. should as constantly affirme you would winne it, in so much that the

question would be brought to this contestation whether lawiers were more learned and skillfull. To which side would you cleaue in this case? *Nephew.* If you suppose me vnable to iudge of their skill and learning, and that they be all equally reputed honestmen, though in deede I cannot well see how that can come to such an obstinate contestation if they be all as they are reputed: I must needes choose the multitude, & either take with the fewest, or else play the foole notoriously. I see well inough what you aym at, to wit, that because Catholike countries are greater then Protestants, iudgment therefore is to be giuen on the Catholikes side. But I pray you,

how shall I know that there be more learned men amongst Catholikes then amongst Protestants? Or that the Catholike Doctours be more learned then ours at home? Tis true I know our learned men saie that they Protestants of other countries are not of the same Religion with ours heare in Englād, yet I see they agree all together against vs, what discordes soeuer they haue amongst themselues.

Peter. Your fresh wits runne to fast, Remember you were supposed to be ignorant of the proportion of their learning in your lawyers case, and therefore choosed the multitude. Wherefore as long as it is constantly confessed that there be farr more learned men

Catholikes, then there be learned Protestants, so long the laye people ignorant and vnable to iudge of learning, must stand conuinced by the multitude, of which this vulgar knowes no more but that they are accounted learned by those amongst whom they liue, as ours are heare with vs. And to giue you farther satisfaction in this poinct, you know that ma for man, by all likelyhood, Readers of Diuinitie are the greateſt ſchollers, their exerciſe and profeſſion (ſpecially if they be of manie yeares) enabling and impooning them more then others who haue not the like occaſion. Of theſe compare the number which England affordes to the multitudes which Catho-

There be more learned Catholikes then Protestants

like countries yeldes. You haue beene in Paris where you might haue seene in some one howse or College more then be in all England, whereof some haue taught Diuinitie a douzen or twentie yeares, fiue or six actually reeding, and as manie perhaps, who hauing spent a great part of their age in that profession, haue now giuen ouer. I speake no secrets, the most ignorant man that is may see and proue what I say with his owne eyes either in Italie, Spaine, Germanie, France, or Lowcountries. And I may adde that the time which one of the Iesuits studies is double to what one in our Vniuersities heere in England doth imploye. Thes being married

and Children, and are, saith S. Paul, *deuided*, one halfe to their bookes, the other to their household. And you know wiues are no friends of bookes, learning and children spring both from the braine, and both require abundance of spirits, and therefore not well matched together. And sure amongst Catholikes a learned resolution is rather to be looked for at a Priest's hands (ordinarily speaking) then from a married man, by reason his time, breeding, and imployment are more proportioned thereunto. Vnlearned Catholikes are nothing (you may adde all that list for mariage sake) not so vnlearned as the Protestants perswade themselues, sith once there is 1. Cor. 7.

first beginners of Protestancie meet with their matches, such as they other did not dare to meete face to face. Or if they did, they still came off with dishonor. Wherefore euerie man that vnderstandes any thing more then his owne home must needes graunt that if number or likelyhood of persons may carie the cause, the question is ended. Whereunto I could adde that reason which you mentioned, how the Protestants in diuers countries are not of one Religion, neither in respect of their Faith or Gouernment. They differ in so many points that they damne one the other for misbeliefe. But because I mine whether the questions wherein they disagree amongst themselues be not of as great importance as those wherein

No two Protestants of one Religion

ſo differ from them all, and you ſhall finde manie of them to be the verie ſame. Nay there be not two *Doctors or perſons* here in England of *one Religion*, no nor two laye men, who geue them ſelues to expound ſcriptures, and make their priuat ſpirit iudge of their beliefe and *creed*. And this, not only becauſe ſo manie variable phãſies grounded euerie one vpõ it ſelfes, cannot poſſibly agree (whereypon you ſhall handly ſee two meete and conferre of Religiõ, but they will diſagree if they talke long) but alſo becauſe all knowledge hath it's vnitie from ſome ſetled and certaine principles, which being not to be found out of the Catholike churche in matter of Religion, there can be

no vnitie of beliefe amongst Protestants. For although our Parlement hath comanded diuers articles to be taught in the churches of England yet doth not the Protestant Clergie acknowledge that the Parlement, who are their flocke and taught by them, haue power to iudge or determine poinctes of doctrine. And in deede it were ridiculous for those, who thinke that an vniuersall Congregation of Bishopps, and the bodie of the whole church may erre in beliefe, should nevertheless attribute that vnerrable power to their owne schollers. Neither doe they, that I know of, but still maintaine constantly their cheefe grounde *that all men are fallible and liable to* erre.

ere. Where by the way you may note, how hardly they deale with Catholikes in punishing them for professing a different faith from theirs, seeing that if we believe differently we must needes professe differently: and they, by their owne confession, not having anie authoritie whereby they can or ought force anie mā to believe as they doe, t is euident that they must per force contradicte their owne principles if they will persecute vs. Now therefore seeing, that to be of *one faith*, is to be of one *setled opinion*, and *setling* cannot be without *infallibilitie* or *necessitie*, the Protestants hauing no common principles which them selues esteeme infallible (euerie mā expounding

why protestants ought not force anie man to believe with them.

ſcripture, (*their only rule of faith*) at his pleaſure, not anie hauing power or authoritie to controle an others interpretation of anie paſſage what ſoeuer) t'is impoſſible anie two miniſters ſhould be of *one faith and Religion.* T'is true, per chãce they may be of one minde to day, but eare night if ether of them light of a place of the ſcripture which after more conſideration ſeemeth to haue an other ſenſe then he thought before, they may well be of different opinions; And this in what pointe how materiall or eſſentiall ſoeuer. Theſe men therefore may be ſaid to be ſome times of one minde or opinion, but neuer of one faith and Religion, faith being like mariage, not to be taken

vp for a yeare and a day, but for all Eternitie. And now to returne to the discourse we ayme at. As the number of our learned men doth farr exceede the number of learned Protestants, so likewise by all likelyhood doth their learning. The English Diuinitie, generally speaking, is nothing but controuersies, which are but the fourth or fift part of Catholike Diuinitie. For besides controuersies, we haue scholasticall Theologie, which explicate's the mysteries of our faith, and shewe's their conformitie to nature and naturall reason. We haue morall Diuinitie, which searche's into the practize of the Sacraments ād precepts of good life. We haue scripture lessons, which diue

The learned Catholikes be more learned then the learned Protestants.

into the deepe ſenſe of the written word of God without farther application. We haue miſticall Theologie, which examine's the extraordinarie waies of conuerſation with God. And laſtly we haue Eccleſiaſticall hiſtorie, which shewe's the progreſſe, increaſe, and practize of Chriſtian faith through all ages and places. And of all theſe we haue, I doe not ſaie bookes or volumes, but whole libraries written and extant amongſt vs. And for other eruditions, as languages, Poetrie, Rhethoricke, Logicke, and Philoſophie, if the Proteſtants haue anie, let them looke into their ſamples, and they ſhall finde the moſt eminent and worthie men to haue beene and to be

Catholikes, so that as of all Religiõs the Christian, so of all Christian's the Catholike is without questiõ the most wise, and the most learned profession. And what I saye is not to be sought out in old manuscripts or learned papers, your eyes and eares will tell it you in Catholike countries, and euen in Paule's church yard, where you may finde multitudes of volumes of all theese sorts of learning written by Catholikes, And if their shopps were well shaked vp, I doubt not but for bookes of worth (except some English pamphletts and a few controuersies) one hundreth for one would be found to haue beene written by Catholikes. What apparence thẽ can there

be, that the Protestants argu-
ments should be so mightie
and so cleerely better then
what Catholikes can saie for
them selues, as to beate downe
the right of Antiquitie and
possessiō, whereof the Catho-
likes are the sole Claymers.

Nephew. I cannot denie but
that your discourse is sound
and grounded vpon common
sense, and vpon such euidence
as when I was in Paris I heard
was there to beeseene, but my
minde was then more fixed
vpon the Tennis court then
vpon such enquiries. But why
might not one replye that all
this and more is necessarie for
the iustifying of so euill a qua-
rell? If Catholikes be not ho-
nest and vertuous men the
more learned they are, the

more dãgerous and more able to maintaine a falſe poſition. And t'is like the Proteſtants would replye in this manner, for they tell vs, that the Pope hath gottẽ ſo mightie a power ouer our verie vnderſtandings that for manie ages we haue bent all our wittes how to maintaine his tiles ãd decrees without anie care of truth or probabilitie, wherefore the more wit and learning the more blindneſſe of paſſion and intereſt.

As the learned Catholikes are more learned thẽ the learned Proteſtãts: ſo they are more vertuous then they.

Vncle. I did not thinke that learning had deſerued ſo ill at your hands as to cenſure it ſo ſeuerely. No, no, coſẽ, onemã, or two, or three may be the more dãgerous for their learning, but not whole multitudes. For of it's owne nature it

is a great instrument of vertue, being the Companiõ of truth, so that there can be no greater signe of truth in anie Religiõ, then to see it beare the touch of reason, and that the professors of it be addicted to learning. Besids, I pray, remember I speake to one who professeth no schollershippe, and therefore doe not inquire what is, or is not, but what is most likely and apparent. It must therefore be knowne that the Religion is false, before it can be presumed that mẽ bẽd and straine their learning to maintaine a falsitie. For otherwise the verie fame of learning beare's with it the credit and esteeme of truth and honestie; And who delight's in learned labours is commonly

free both from quarrellsome intereſt, and hurtefull pleaſures, out of which doe ſpring all cunning fraude and circumvention, wherevpon a meere ſcholler is quitte, by this verie name, from ſuſpicion of guile and craftineſſe. But how ſoeuer our Religion hath, beſides learning, manifeſt ſignes of honeſtie and vertue. For all the pointes wherein we differ from Proteſtants are of that nature, that they incite vs to the practize of ſome vertue or other. As we ſaie charitie and the keeping of the commandements doe iuſtifie, and deſerue eternall reward. Confeſſion bring's the remembrance and ſorrow for our ſinnes, ſatisfaction is performed by good deedes, Praying for the

dead, praying to Saincts, keeping and reuerēcing Pictures of Christ and his Saincts, And aboue all the presence of God in the B. Sacrament, All which be matters of great moment and consideration continually prouoking vs to liftvp our mindes to God and heauen, to thinke of the life to come, and to practize vertuous actions. The most earnest Protestant, who hath but cast his eye beyond the sea, cannot denie but ther's a maine difference in exteriour deuotion amongst Catholikes aboue Protestats. Our churches are open euerie daye, seruice and Masses said all the fore noone, ād in diuers there is seruice a great part of the after noone. Our seruice is much longer then the Prote-

ſtants. Our ceremonies and magnificence verie ſpectable. Our Sacraments more in nũber, more frequented, and done with more ſtate and reuerence. The riches of our churches, Altars, Pictures ineſtimable. Our ſolemnities and Triumphs glorious, perpetuall ſermons on feſtifall days, and on euerie daye in the lent and Aduent, the B. Sacrament often expoſed with great concurſe of deuout people, as all Proteſtant trauellers can witneſſe. Adde to theſe the multitudes of Religious men and women, whoſe profeſſion is retired from buſineſes and the world to haue more time to conuerſe with God. The often miracles, the frequent Sainctſ and holy men, that cannot be

denied but at leaſt we thinke and ſaie we haue thē. In a word the Proteſtant's faith ſeeme's like the *piece of monie buried in the grounde*, and the Catholike's like a *burning torch* which forceth all within it's ſphere to caſt their eyes vpon it. I knowe the readie anſwere is, that all is but hypocriſie, and that there is as great wickedneſſe amongſt Catholikes as amongſt Proteſtants. But I could wish that hee who is thus rash ād readie to ſaie this, were as curious and carefull to know how to proue it. For it were abſurde to thinke that who ſtrike's but one blowe in twentie in a ſmith's shoppe should make as great a dinte as hee who ſtrike's twētie. And ſuerly no leſſe foolish it were

to thinke that whose harts and hãds are continually busied about God and godly things should make no greater impressiõ in their soules thẽ they who saie not a prayer once a mõth, and whose cheefe deuotiõ is to heare a mã make a pleasing discourse in a pulpit. I wll not denie but that there bee as fowle sinners and as manie amongst Catholike as amõgst Protestants, if not more and wickeder. For sacriledge cannot be so great where sainctitie is lesse, and who best knowe's his Masters will must needes deserue most stripes for his trespasse. No man could damne his posteritie but who had original iustice to loose, nor could anie betraye Christ but who had eate bread at his ta-

ble. Wherefore Protestants cannot be so wicked as Catholikes, hauing not such a saintly faith nor such a sacred church to disgrace and abuse. Yet doe I not thinke but that a good argumēt may be made for our church by it's saintitie, remēbring well what an English Protestant Clergie man of note, who had beene at Rome after his conuersion, was wont to saie when he heard anie speake against the vices of the Court of Rome. I haue knowne, quoth he, manie and manie of the Protestant clergie as honest men as euer I met with all in my life, in whose hands I durst vēture my state and life, but I neuer knew anie who had the reputation and esteeme amongst wise mē to be a saint,

or of extraordinarie holinesse: Here in Rome I see in a smale number of great Prelats two or three that haue the fame of extraordinarie vertue, and the like I find of all sorts both of churchmen and laitie, some to be reputed exemplarly holy. As for the vices, whereof I heare the reports, and doubt not but they are to true, yet I see they are caried discreetly and breake not forth into anie publicke scandall. So that although Protestats haue diuers morall honest men and Catholikes manie wicked, yet doth it not follow that they are equall in behauiour. For Catholikes haue some Saincts Protestants none, Catholikes faultes are in proportiõ fewer, Protestant's good workes ve-

rie defectiue in the like proportion, And this difference is such an one as worthily make's a marke of the Catholike church, and as in deede is befitting a church made of men who beare immortall soules in vessels of flesh and bloode.

The Pope's spirituall power is no tyranie but Wasteur the same.

But I had almost forgotten the difficultie you made of the Pope's tyrannizing and forcing all men's witts to serue him. Doe you thinke he tyranize's the bodies or the mindes? If the mindes, why then he hath persuaded them his pwer is lawfull, giuen by Iesus Christ and continued since his time. Wherefore these mē who are thus persuaded being so manie, so learned, and withall so vpright, as that for conscięce sake they will forgoe the ve-

rie libertie of their vnderſtandings, make a great argument that the truth is as they ſaie. For otherwiſe how eaſie were it for a king of France, or Spaine, or Emperour to follow the example of England, Holland, and diuers ſtates of Germanie who would aide and backe thē if they would renounce this pretended Tyrannie, whereas theſe Reuolters frō the church of Rome did it without anie preſent example, nay with the deteſtation of all their neighbours. Beſides all the Pope's names and actions are regiſtred if they did anie thing of note, if they changed but their attire, conſecrated a Biſhop, ſent a Cardinal's cappe, or the like, all is vpon record; Only this action of conquering the

whole world in the ware of an vniuerſall father, of ſeuing this ſpirituall throne not only a boue Kings and Monarches Bishopps and Patriarkes, but euen aboue the wiſedome of the ſages, and aboue the valour of vndaunted courages, this only, I ſaie, by all Hiſtorians muſt haue beene accounted vnworthie of mention. But remember, coſen, that commō ſenſe teache's vs, That a thing ſo much againſt the generall current of the publicke church of Chriſt for ſo manie ages ought to be well proued according to the rule you granted me euen now, before it paſſe without controule.

Nephew. Truly, ſir, me thinke's you ſpeake with reaſon and common ſenſe. Yet this

authoritie being so great, I see not, Why it may not of it selfe, and by it's instruments worke such an effect, as that learned men (vpon whose number I am to rely) may not become partially affected in the iudgment of Religion, and consequently the greater number be more corrupted then the lesser, and so the opinion of three were to be preferred before the opinion of the seuẽteene. Nay in my iudgment experience tell's vs that not euerie tenth person amongst learned Catholikes doe know the true value and force of our Aduersaries arguments, but with a preoccupated dispositiõ vndervalue them when perhapps they cannot giue a full and satisfactorie answere vnto

them. And how should it be otherwise, sithence from our childhood we are taught to rely vpon the church for matters of Religion, and to reiect and hate anie mā who should seeke to make a contrarie impression in vs. This being plāted in vs in our tender age, and growing with nature cannot choose but make a vehement preoccupation in vs whē we come to be able to iudge of controuersies in Religion. Not is it to the pourpose whether it be fit that we haue such an impression or no, for I oppose not the thing, but the argument which vrge's for the greater number of learned men.

Vncle. And haue you not marked the like amongst Pro-

teſtāts, ād much more amōgſt Puritants? And doe you not finde that thoſe who ſlight Catholike arguments, are no leſſe preoccupated then the Catholikes you ſpeake of? Nay if you marke it, they greateſt contemners of their Aduerſaries argumēts, be they Catholikes or Proteſtants, are commonly the moſt zealous, or rather the moſt ignorant of the zealous. So that in deede the true cauſe of this partialitie is ignorance, and not anie prohibition, which contrariwiſe is a great prouoker to make men doubt of their Religion. For euer ſince our Grand mother *Eue* harkened to the firſt *why did God*, all precepts (whoſe reaſon we vnderſtand not) haue beene ſuſpicious vnto vs,

Tell me then, I pray, if you were in a shipp where there were a Pilote and his mate, and some Captane who had neuer beene at sea before, and in a controuersie about their iourney they fall to variance, The Pilote and his Mate saying this is the waie, the Captane by reports or guesses of his owne, saie's, that's not the waie, And thereupon the Cõpanie in the shipp take's parts, whether side in this case would you iudge to be partiall?

Nephew. T'is cleere that those who ioyne with the Captane are partiall, for where the one side hath skill the other none, t'is euident that if the question be of skill we ought adhere to the skilfull. This I saie is euidẽt, if there be no par-

ticular circumstãce or speciall reason to the contrarie, As in our case if the Pilote had some interest to carrie his shipp out of the waie, then it were an other matter, but stãding precisely in the termes of your case, it is cleere ô which side the partialitie is, for the Pilote hauing skill the captaine none, the Pilot's aduise were to be preferred in common sense, and to side with him were wisdome.

Vnle. Why then who adhere's to vnskillfull iudgers in matters of Religion are partiall, and who adhere's to experts in those matters are wise and rationall. Wherefore if the seuenteene adhere to the Mistrisse and teacher of Religiõ, and the three fly from hir,

doth not these by this verie act make them selues partiall, and those impartiall? You must first know whether side goes the rightwaie before you can suppose ether side to be partiall, and consequently the number will still preuaille as long as t'is in doubt whether side is partiall, And if one side adhere to that part which was in prepossession, the other plead against possession, you are bound by the law of nature, by the institution of all cõmunities, and by commõ sense to iudge the pleaders against possession to be partiall vntill they haue proued their motiõ so reasonable, as wil ouerbalãce the great authoritie of possession which is against them. Farther if you consider that

Christian

Christian Religion is *supernaturall*, that is, such an one as cannot be learned but frō Almightie God, to wit, from the Apostles, or from them whō the Apostles or their Disciples haue taught, you will see that there is no disputing about Religion, but only to aske what hath beene taught vs, which none can tell vs but those whose life and professiō it is to teach vs that doctrine which them selues first learned, to wit, the Bishopps and Pastors of the church. So that who doubt's of what these mē haue taught and doe teach vs, must needes be ignorant of the meanes and waie of knowing Christian doctrine, and passionately refuse the true ād certaine rule thereof.

Nephew I see myne errour, and it was the same as if one should condemne a man of partialitie who keepe's possession of his owne, because he yeild's not vp the state, whereof he is possessed before iudgmēt be giuē against him: whereas contrariwise in the Ciuill law (which I once studied a litle) if one be put out of quiet possession, his Aduersarie may not pleade vntill he be put in againe. And sure of all cases the fowlest is to doubt in matters of Religion before one hath reason, for where authoritie is plainely on the one side, there none cā doubt without wronging that Authoritie vnlesse he haue a reason which doth ouer ballance it. And so I am satisfied in this pointe.

Poole. Take this with you nephew, that generally no cõtrouerſies of Religion fall out without ſome motiues of intereſt on both ſides, and ſo both ſides may be ſuſpected of partialitie, but cheefely that which beginne's the change. Wherefore ſuppoſe men were forbiddẽ to doubt, that would be of litle force if once they ſawe their commanders were intereſſed, vnleſſe they ſawe withall that they could not mende them ſelues. Beſides in our ſchooles all things are caled in queſtion, which would not be ſuffered if it endãgered the churche's beliefe. Laſtly being t'is great ſchollers that gouerne men's iudgments, if they did finde by their learning anie other ſure ground of

Religion. *then standing to the churche's authoritie and iudgment*, they would esteeme as much of hir Commandes and Sampson did of the Philistins shutting their gates vpon him. And so wee see by experience that all truly learned ād vnpassionat mē on our side (besides the motife of the churche's authoritie) adhere vpon pure reason to the Catholike *truth*, and will protest vpon all that's holy that they would be of the same Religiō though there were no commande, finding it most conformable to reason and to the grounds of Christianitie.

Nephew. The truth is I know not how to answere your discourse, yet perhapps a Protestant would saie that all's but

probabilitie and likelihood, and therefore to hazard a mā's estate vpon *peraduentures* were some thing hard and not verie rationally done. Wherefore I should be glad to conceiue more fully

The force and efficacitie of these your discourses and perſuaſiõs. §. 4.

VVCLE. Why coſen, what ſecuritie doe your marchāts, your ſtates mē, your ſoliers, thoſe that goe to law, nay euen thoſe that till their grounds and worke for their liuings, what ſecuritie, I ſaie, doe all theſe goe vpon? Is it greater thē the ſecuritie which theſe grounds doe afford? Surely no. And yet no man eſteeme's them fooliſh. All

human affaires are hazardous, and haue some aduenture in them. And therefore who require's euident certaintie only in matters of Religion discouer's in him self a lesse minde to the goods promised in the next life, then to these which he seeke's here in this vvorld vpon weaker assurãce. How-soeuer the greatest euidence that can be to him that is not capable of conuincing demonstrations (which the greatest part of mankinde fall shorte of) is but cõiecturall, for men doe not generally distinguish betwixt a solide and a wittie proofe, and are as soone taken with a glosse or iesting speach as with a demonstration. Let but this veric proofe I haue told you be put to some two men,

the one more, the other lesse iudicious, and the one perhapps will hold it for euident, the other only for apparent and likly. And certainely it is manifest that if our church was once the true church, they who made a breach from hir must needes haue euident proofes of hir corruption, or elsse be culpable of faction and schisme. And yet of these two men I propose, the one peraduenture will take this argumēt only for plausible, and at the least checke forgoe it, the other looking into the nature of Gouermēt and seeing what a flaw the contrarie position breede's in it, and how in effect it destroye's all Gouerment will thinke it so strong that what soeuer is or can be

said against it, is but the play-
ing of witt against pure euide-
ce. Farther if we Catholikes
hold the truth of scripture as
conscientiously as anie Pro-
testant, and therefore that all
controuersies betwixt vs and
them are only concerning the
sense of it, and not touching
the truth of it, t'is manifest that
Catholikes must ether be such
dull dunces as not to vnder-
stand their arguments, or so
willfull as not to acknowledge
what they see ād know, other-
wise surely they would agree
with Protestants in all pointes
which they could cōuince and
demonstrate. And against this
man who perceth deeper into
the strength of this argument
see's, that although some ti-
mes learning may faile, ād that

vertue may haue a bridle for a while, yet would not learning be learning if it should not for the most part worke it's effect in men, and make them more capable of reason then others: And much lesse canit be true vertue which is seldome efficacious, sithence vertue's nature is to be *operative*. Wherefore this vnderstanding man that see's there's a more constant pourſuite of vertue and learning on the one side then on the other, conclude's euidently that there cā be no extraordinarie weakneſſe on the learneder and more vertuous side in cōparison of the other. And where he see's more meanes, paines, and fruits of learning and vertue on the one side then on the other, he

will no more doubt (suppo-
sing this be a constant and set-
led course on both sides) but
that of necessitie there must
be more learning and vertue
on that side where he sees
these effects, no more, I say,
then he can doubt whether ne-
cessarie causes will haue their
effects, as whether fire and
towe put together will burne,
or whether effects can be with-
out their causes, as houses,
clockes, and the like without
Carpenters, smiths, and other
Artizans. Yet perhapps he
that barely looke's vpon the
superficies of this discourse ta-
ke's it only for a pleasing and
probable consequence. Ioyne
to this, the multitudes of Anti-
quitie (I meane those ages
wherein the Protestants ac-

knowledge the Raigne of Poperie) and surely the there will not remaine to an vnderstanding man anie iuste cause to feare or complaine of hazard, but rather a great occasion to admire and praise God's wisdome, who hath prouided so short and secure a meanes for euerie man who is so happy and carefull as to acknowledge and embrace this guide of eternall saluatiō: looking with an eye of commiseration vpō those, whose dispositiōs being not fitted to the sight of this truth, remaine in doubt and ignorance by diuing into questions wherein they are not able to finde satisfaction, and so cast them selues awaie, not for want of meanes, but ether through their owne pride, or

by the misleading of their Directors, Who not seeing what's conuenient for the disposition of their disciples, throwe the vpon the Rockes in stead of giuing them a fit harbour to anker in, for if they would rely vpon this plane and open waie of our discourse, commō sense would tell them (if not what's true) at least what they ought to follow, ād that as cleerely as that two and three are fiue.

Nephew. I confesse the euidence you pleade is greate, yet me thinke's one might obiect, that seeing we heare it so often and so strongly beate into vs that all men are falible, and that nature it selfe seeme's to teach the same, therefore as on the one side your reasons

force me to grant that t'is the wiser course to vēter this waie; so on the other, I still remaine with this disposition that it may peraduenture be false, which is able to shake a man's resolution and cowle his affection.

Vncle. Cosen, you desire great matters, and peraduenture more then your age and wauering disposition is able to beare. Yet to complye with your good desires, I will put you in the waie if you will haue patience to follow the tracke, and you shall see

That it is no hard matter that Christ's law should haue descended entire vnto vs. §. 5.

FIrst therefore tell me, I pray, what time thinke you

Christ and his Apostles imployed in preaching the Ghospell in anie one countrie?

Nephew. I know Christ imployed some three yeares and a halfe or thereabouts, for I thinke the time is not precisely agreed vpon by Cronologers, But for the Apostles that I know not, nor cā I guesse to what pourpose you aske me this question.

Vncle. Is it not like the Apostles bestowed neere about as much time? S. Paule him selfe saie's so, telling the Clergie of Ephesus, that for three yeares he had not ceassed day and night to exhorte them with teares, and warne them to take heede of false teachers. And we may well thinke the like of the rest of the Apostles,

whereſoeuer they could conueniently doe it, but ſpecially in the churches in which they made their Reſidence. But why thinke you tooke they ſo much time for ſo short a doctrine, as you ſee Chriſtian doctrine is, being included in our Creede.

Nephew. No doubt but their imployment was to make their diſciples and the people vnderſtand perfectly, and fully comprehende all pointes of Chriſtian doctrine, to reſolue all doubts and difficulties, to make the apprehenſion of the doctrine ſincke into the verie ſoules of the people, and to ſetle a forme of Gouerment and Conuerſatiō, and to invre the firſt Chriſtiās to the practize of this doctri-

ne whereby it might subsist and continue as long as possibly it could. For this I see is the *dictamē* of prudence and wisdome in such a case, and the course all those who foūd new institutions.

Vncle. You saie well. And surely such a time for a litle Prouince of about two or three dayes iournay's semidiameter was verie sufficient for the instructing of their disciples in all materiall pointes and setling of instructers to succeede them. But in case immediately after the decease or departure of the Apostle there should arise (according to our sauiours forewarning) *false Prophets* or *Rauenous wolues* vnder pretence of sainctitie endeauoring to deuoure

the flocke, nay that euen some amongst them selues out of vanitie should beginne some new doctrine, drawing disciples after them, and so making them selues head of a partie and of a doctrine contrarie to that which the Apostle had taught, vrging reasons out of nature and texts out of that Apostles owne writings by whom they were taught, or out of his fellow Apostles, and strengthen his partie by the adherence of manie of the weaker sort, what I saie would the Gouernors and teachers of the faithfull doe in this case? How would they behaue thē selues to hinder the ruine of their weaker breetheren?

How controuersies were decided immediatly after the Apostles.

Nephew. I doe imagine that meeting together they

would examine this new Doctrine, *taking for their rule* that doctrine which the Apostle deliuered vnto them, And knowing that he could nether contradict him self nor anie of his Breetheren, being all inspired by the Holy Ghost, they would conclude, that the Innouators reasons were captious, his texts wrong vnderstood if they were obscure, or corrupted if they were plaine. For nothing could be so euident vnto them as that, which for three yeares together had beene perpetually beaten into them, where in they had beene continually examined and cleered, and which had beene so long the fundation of their new manner of life and practize; so that, this must needes be

the moſt euident vnto them of all things, and therefore they would ſurely forgoe all other rules to gouerne them ſelues by this, as being moſt free from errour,

Vncle. Your concluſion follow's plainely. For they hauing no other ſtay of their beliefe, then that S. Paul (for example) had taught them ſo, is cleere that to them theſe two queſtions were but one, *whether the opinio propoſed was true?* and *whether it was according to what S. Paul had taught them?* And therefore to be againſt that which they had beene taught, to them, was to be falſe. So that there nether was nor could be anie other queſtion in the church at that time in matters of faith, but

whether the Apostles had taught such a doctrine or no? For the Apostles hauing spēt so much time in teaching Christian doctrine in so little a Prouince, what they had not taught must needes be presumed not to be necessarie, and consequently not deseruing to make a schisme and breach amongst Christiās, and what they had taught to be without all controuersie true and certaine. Wherefore if such an Innouator would not stand to this iudgment, he was to be expelled the church, as disagreeing from the Christians in the *principall rule* and *soueragne Tribunal of Christianitie* by *which*, and *only which*, they could at that time decerne and decide what was Christian doctrine what not.

Happie that age in which it was so easie to resolue anie difficultie arising, for it was no more then to meete together and aske one an other, *How haue you beene taught?* And all was ended, and who should haue resisted this decision was to be cast out with common consent as a reprobate. But tell me, cosen, how long doe you thinke this *Happinesse* cõtinued in the church?

Nephew. For the time of the Apostles and of their disciples (who are commonly caled Apostolicall men) ther's no question to be made; no nor of the age of the disciples of these Apostolicall men; To whom I see not why I may not add yet an other age, for doubtlesse those Apostolicall

men must needes haue beene of that reputation as that what soeuer was constantly remembred to haue beene their doctrine, was likewise to be esteemed the doctrine of the Apostles their Masters, supposing it was knowne to bee vniuersally and generally theirs, and not the opinion of some one or two of them only.

Vncle. And will it be a stumbling blocke vnto you if we add yet an other descent, to wit, of the Grandchildren of these Apostolicall mē, for the memorie of publicke and generally practized things is fresh from Grandfathers vnto their Grandchildren. So that this degree or goldē age may well consist of fiue descents, that is, of some 200 yeares, al-

loving 40. yeares to a descēt, which is not much, seing that witneses of 60. yeares are ordinarily found in euerie busines in the same Prouince, and therefore where the question is of a publicke and vniuersall practize which concernes manie countries and nations who haue intercourse and communication together, such witneses may be much more easily found. But what shall we saie of the next ensuing age?

Nephew. I conceiue that these descents you speake of may easily haue reached to Constatine's time, when Christian Religiō being publicke, the multitudes of fathers and writers would supplie the defect of this αὐτόψιον or self seeing into the well spring of Christi-

anitie. But whether you driue that waie or no, I know not.

Vncle. It is not needfull, for ſithence the laſt age doth directly know what was the Apoſtles doctrine, All ſuch ages as can reach to knowe the doctrine and practize of that laſt age, are able certainely to reſolue (though in a lower degree) anie ariſing difficultie; not becauſe they cā immediately tell, that ſuch a pointe is contrarie to the doctrine of the Apoſtles, but becauſe they can tell that t'is againſt the doctrine of the fiſt deſcēt, which doctrine they know to be the dokrine of the Apoſtles. Wherefore vpon the like ground we may add fiue deſcēts more, which according to our former computation will make

vp

vp 400. yeares, and peraduenture by extēt may reach to fiue or 600 yeares after Christ that is; to the second conuersion of nations, I meane to the conuersion of those barberous people which ouerunne the Roman Empire, and brought almost all the world backe vnto the formerly extirpated paganisme.

Nephew. Why then wee neede no more, for the Protestāts confesse that Poperie hath raigned since Phocas his time; nay they sticke not to saie that Gregorie the Great was the last good and first bad Pope, seeming to thinke that frō him beganne, *that* which they call Poperie. And truly in his Dialogues which are sett out in English there's more then

enough to show that the Religion of his time was the same which we now profesſe And we that haue our cõuerſion from him (according to venerable Bede) wee, I ſaie, who are deſcended from the Saxons, neuer haue had anie Religiõ but *that* which the Proteſtants call Poperie, And therefore to vs English men, it is moſt cleere, that we neuer had anie Religiõ ſince Gregorie the great's time, but Poperie. And therefore if the Religion that then raigned was the faith of the Apoſtles, it will euidently follow that Poperie was their faith.

Vncle. Surely not only writers but euen Records and Monuments are ſo thicke ſince the conuerſion of thoſe

nations which ouer runne the Romã world, that no peruerse man cã require more euidẽce, And surely it was God's prouidence who setled as it were a new world, and purged the old, whilest Religion could yet looke backe and see hir head, as it were, with one vewe. But I hoped you would haue induced a farther consequence and applyed the argument to later ages.

Nephew. I am affraid these calculations may ouer reach me, for I see the father and the sonne's age doe concurre in some part, and therefore by counting them seuerally the number of yeares will be greater then in deede ought to be allowed.

Vncle. You saie well, and

therefore we will only take that number of yeares which the father ordinarily liueth before the birth of his ſonne, As if the ſonne be ſuppoſed to be 20. yeares of age when the father teſtifieth, and the father 60. Which you ſee is verie cõmon, and ſo the number of yeares of one deſcent will be 40. Which is the number we put. But if the father be 80. when the ſonne is 20. then the number of one deſcent wilbe 60. Which though it be ſome what great, becauſe it is rare that a man hath a child at 60. yett 'is not ſo rare but a thouſand may bee found in a competent extent, as in the Kingdome of England, and this number is amply ſufficient for the effect we deſire, for fiue

descents of 60. yeares make 300. yeares. And hauing tould you how a generall practize of anie countrie is knowne by a kind of *self seeing* for fiue descents, which include's at least 200. yeares, it will follow that coũting downe frõ Christ time to ours by two ages at a time, we may frame our discourse thus. As those who liued in the beginning of the third age could certainely know they held the Apostles doctrine; so those who liued in the beginning of the fift age, could certainely know they held the doctrine of those of the beginning of the third age, that is, the doctrine of the Apostles. And by the like cõsequẽce those of the 7. age will be certaine they are in the fa-

me faith of thoſe of the fift, and thoſe of the 9. in the faith of thoſe of the 7. And ſo to our verie ſelues, And all are certaine that they are in the faith of the Apoſtles. The reaſon of this conſequence is, becauſe two ages is not ſo great a ſpace, but that certaine knowledge of publicke and generall chãges through a kingdome (much more through manie) may be eaſily had; nor yet are two ages ſo litle, as that a great errour could lurke vnſeene and lye ſmoothered for ſo long a time. We therefore who now liue in communion with the Roman church know certainely, that our forefathers of the 16. and 15 ages did conceiue that this faith and doctrine which we hold, did, I

saie, conceiue and thinke it to haue descended vnto them from the Apostles, And we know likewise that they could not conceiue and thinke so, but that they knew the 14. and 13. ages did believe the same; Nor those of the 14. and 13. ages could not haue the same beliefe, vnlesse they had seene and receiued it, *in* and *from* the 12. and the 11. age. And putting all these together, (the certaintie whereof is immediatly founded in this our age) you see they comprehende six ages, if we put 40. yeares to a descent, and will comprehende 8. or 9. ages if we put 60. to a descent. So that two or at most three such cõpositiõs will reach beyond Christ's birth, And therefore we doe not,

nor cannot, want euidence but eyes to see it.

Nephew. Your discourse will be good, supposing the pointe in cõtrouersie be some publicke and great matter, or a notorious change in the face of God's church. But why might not some speculatiue pointe creepe in without being taken notice of, such as was the pointe of the Arrians or Pelagians, if there had not happened withall so great an opposition and quarelling as shaked almost the whole church.

why no new pointe cã creepe into the church without a great change.

Vncle. There be two reasons why no pointe of Christian doctrine can be so smale as to creepe in without a great change. The one is because Christian doctrine is a disci-

pline whose parts are so knit together as that one thred cānot be broken but it will rauell through manie stiches, As stō th' Arriā heresie denying Christ to be God, it would follow, *no Trinitie*, and so Christians would easily become naturall philosophers and Pagans, *no Incarnation, that* is, no God and man in one person, *All the payeres and adorations which the church had vsed hitherto were to be changed*, *The forme of baptisme were to be altered*, And thus we might goe through the most part of Christian doctrine, if we looke into the sequels of Arrianisme. And such like consequences may be deduced out of Pelagianisme, and out of almost all other heresies, which haue not

runne beyõd all face of Christianitie, becauſe they were quickly oppoſed, and ſo hindered from ſhewing the ſerpent's taile which lurked behinde. The other reaſon is, becauſe no new doctrine can preuaile in the church of God without impeaching *tradition*, the rule of faith, for that being once broken and reiected, by the ſame right and principle by which they profeſſe one errour, they may profeſſe anie, And you ſee the diſciples of Hereſiarckes neuer faile to grow worſe thẽ their Maſters, Luther broke the Ice by appealing to ſcripture, Suinglius went farther then he, th' Anabaptiſts exceeded the Swinglians, the Adamiſtes, paſſed th' Anabaptiſts, the Socinians

the Adamistes, and some went beyond Christianitie, others euen beyond common sense, wherefore it is impossible anie breach should be made in the church without a maine and notorious chage in the whole face of Christianitie.

Nephew. I see now, vncle, it was not without cause you asked me, what time the Apostles imployed in teaching Christiā doctrine to some one Prouince or Countrie, your whole discourse seeme's to depende vpō this, that the Apostles did not barely tell the faithfull what Christ had donne and taught, but did inculcate and beat it into thē both by words and actions, invring thē to the practize of their beliefe, their beliefe being the ground of

their actions, and their actions the effects of their beliefe, and therefore could not be altered without a maine change both in their faith and practize, their beliefe mantaining their practize and their practize strengthening their beliefe. And truly I see this is a cõnaturall waie to keepe Religion vncorrupted, and that nature, and necessitie, droue the first Christians vpon occasion of anie controuersie, to seeke what the Apostles had taught, which being once begunne the ensuing Christians would follow the same course, as lõg as controuersies could be resolued this waie, which by your discourse may be done at this daie. But I learned in Philosophie that *a posse ad esse*

is no good argument, for if it were sufficiēt to proue a thing hath beene donne becanse it could haue beene donne no man would be innocent, but who is impotent, And therefore I feare we are not much aduanced, vnlesse you cā shew me

That if Christ's law could haue beene conserued it hath beene conserued. §. 6

Vncle. Why so, nephew; you know if anie man be accused, his denyall cleere's him sufficiently vntill proofe be brought against him, And when it is brought t'is yet sufficient for his defence to shew, it doth not conuince, which if he can doe, the law laye's no

hold of him. And shall not the clayme of so great a part of the world standing in possession and mantaining the innocentie of the church be heard and esteemed good vntill the aduerse partie hath made his proofes cleere and euident against them? Certes you haue forgotten your resolution concerning your wiues honnor for whom you were so earnest but now. Againe we must surely cõceite the church to be a thing planted by Almightie God with no lesse blessing then *that* which he gaue to men and beasts at their creation, whereby they haue beene conserued to this dayé, for sithence our Redemptiõ cost him no lesse then our creation, we cannot

esteeme his *Blessing of continuance* to be of lesse worth and vertue in the one then in the other. And t'is much more easie to conceiue how the church is and may be continued, thē how mankinde hath beene and wilbe conserued, whereof I thinke no man doubts. And truly doe but consider how vnequall and vniust a conditiō it is, that the clayme of the present church shall not be heard, vnlesse she can confute all the *peraduentures* that wit may inuent, And solue all the arguments which the infinite varietie of time, place, and occasions may haue giuen waie vnto, And then you will see how vnreasonable an Aduersarie he is who will not be content with anie

satisfaction but such as man's nature scarsely affordes. Yet to answere fully to you maxime, first I will oppose an other vnto it, and by comparing the we shall better vnderstand the meaning of them both. And t'is that *frustra est potentia quæ nunquam reducitur ad actum*, Wherevnto we may add that God, the Author of nature, neuer made anie thing in vaine, so that when the same power or possibilitie is ordained for diuers effects or ends, then if anie of it's effects be brought to passe it hath so farr atleast got it's end as that it cannot be laid to haue beene made in vaine, And therefore t'is no good argument to argue from the power or possibilitie to anie one of it's effects in

particular, becauſe it's ẽd may be ſufficiently obſerued by an other effect. But if the power or poſſibilitie haue but one effect then your firſt maxime faile's, by reaſon of the ſecõd, for being the power hath but one effect, if *that* be not put, the power muſt needes be in vaine. Wherefore putting ſuch a poſſibilitie, leaſt it ſhould be fruſtrate, you muſt needes put the effect, and conſequently the argument is ſtill good, there is a power or poſſibilitie therefore an effect. And this follow's moſt cleerely in our caſe, for if Almightie God haue ſet cauſes which may and cã make his church eternall, that is, if he haue put a power or poſſibilitie of *eternall duration* in his church, This effect, to

wit, *euerlasting continuance* being of such a nature that it can be but one, t'is euident that ether this effect will follow, or else the possibilie is frustrate ād put to no end, which in a worke of such a moment as that it is the verie ayme and end of all Gods workes, it were more then absurde in common sense to grant such a consequēce. And to declare this more particularly let vs considere that where there are manie varieties, that which causeth defect in one causeth abundance in an other. As if in diuers countries vnder seuerall climats, there be lōg drought or raine, the drought in Spaine will cause want of corne, here in England and in the low countries a mayne harueſt: And

Why Christiā faith cānot be destroyed.

contrariewise much wet here causeth dearth, in Spaine and Affricke plentie. So likewise the Catholike faith being dispersed through manie seuerall countries, what in one countrie make's it faile, in an other will make it flourish. The hate betwixt France and Spaine made Luther's proceedings to be fauored in Germanie by the Princes which leaned to the french, and the same hatred made Spaine and Italie to oppose them more vehemently. The power and authoritie of some one mā in one countrie may oppresse the church, whereas in an other, euen to discountenance that man, it shal be vpheld. And as in place so in time, diuers occasions make it now fauored now mis-

liked, but t'is impoſſible, it being truth and conformable to reaſon, that there should be anie ſo generall and vniuerſall occaſion as to make it hated in all times and places, which would be neceſſarie for a totall ruine. And this is it, which mantaine's all the progreſſe of nature, to wit, becauſe it hath rootes and principles in being, for no one ſorte of liuing things, which haue being in manie farr differẽt Climats, can be exterminated, by reaſõ the contraries which muſt diſtroye it, are nether vniuerſall in place nor time, and therefore thoſe contraries being ſpent, the ſeedes of nature recouer them ſelues, ſprout out, and budd againe new brãches of the ſame kinde. So it fareth

with Christian beliefe and doctrine, which becauſe it is ſo like and ſo connaturall to nature, all it's oppoſites muſt needes be againſt nature and violent, and conſequently not durable; which being gone, then muſt of neceſſitie thoſe, in whoſe harts Religion is rooted, bloſſome againe and bring forth ſuch delightfull ſauours and fruicts as will draw ād attract mē's ſoules, ād ſpread it ſelfe amongſt the multitudes, frō whom it had beene violently banished. Wherefore that the church in this or that time, be oppreſſed, is a thing within the compaſe of natute's mutabilitie; But that in all Countries and at all times it should be oppreſſed to death ſurpaſſeth the power of

mutable causes, Which were not mutable if they should so long and in so different circūstances euer haue the same effect; yea nature it self and it's Author would be ouercome if such long violence could so oppresse it as to extinguish it, It being nature's cheefe flower and greateſt treasure planted by the expresse handy worke of the ommpotent and wise framer thereof.

Nephew. Your discourse seemee's good, for I see that mē, who in a case of great importance will not be content with what is proportionall to their capacitie, but seeke a certitude so great as them selues are not capable to iudge of, being not beaten to thoses sciences in which such cer-

taintie is vsuall, those men, I saie, must needes come short of what they desire, if truly they doe desire it, for I beliue the affectiō of wealth, pleasure, or some fore-made iudgment doth carie them against the simple and plaine directiō of free reason. How soeuer, vncle, seeing it was so easie for the church to haue beene conserued entire in faith, me thinke's it should not be hard to shew in effect and in particular from age to age that it hath beene conserued.

Vncle. If we could proue that Bishops ether in Generall or Nationall Councells had once in two or three hundreth yeares taken care that no corruptiōs should be introduced, this might be effected, but that

depende's vpon bookes and and hiſtories; which you and I will not now medle withall.

Nephew. I beleeue thoſe hiſtories are not ſo doubtfull but that generally Proteſtants doe ad will acknowledge the. And by my pore skill I know that there neuer paſſed 300. yeares ſince Chriſt's time without a Councell, and without condemning ſome hereticke, ſo that t'is cleere the church hath had ſufficiēt care in this kinde. Yet becauſe I haue heard your ſelf complaine of the slouth of men who ſeeke not into the grounds of ſciēces, and often ſaie, that far more thē is, might be knowne if the principles were rightly laide for it, and the waie trodden, nay that all God's workes

hang

hang so together by connexion of causes and effects as that there's no effect whose cause by diligence might not be found. I must therefore intreate you to condescende a litle euen to the hardnesse of those men's harts, who require more in this subiect then in anie other, and seeke the cause why the church and faith of Christ cannot faille. For sithe we haue found by experience these 1600. yeares that it hath not so failed as that it hath not euer beene generally and vniuersally visible, and hath both indured and florished thus long, surely it hath some forcible cause, and in deede such an one, as can neuer faile, but will still worke the same effect. And this were to shew

That no great errour could creepe into the church of God.

VVHat, Gosen, you lay to bandie ask vpon me. Who knowes, why the world hath dured thus long? Or why mankinde was not extinct many yeares ago? And must I tell you why God's church hath not, nor cannot faile? I am ashamed to answere curious licentious braines, the negatiues of a wittie man will put to the most learned Christian vpon earth. Yet to content you, I will endeauour aboue my strength, but you must ease me a little, and answere me to what your self see's euident. Tell you know that the church being the Congre-

gation of the faithfull cannot fale but by the losse of faith. And faith may be lost two waies, by ignorance, or by error. For so we see a particular man who once had faith if he come to loose it, this either by negligence and not conning it, and so forgette it, or else he is disswaded from it, and induced to believe some different doctrine. So likewise to a multitude of men the one or the other must needes happē vnles they cannot be depriued of the faith which they once had. And because pure ignorance is a meere negatiue, or not knowing, the first question I will aske you is, *Whether you thinke a people once instructed in anie Religion can so forgette it, or that they fall not*

How faith is lost.

into some other Religion: but how could it be without any Religion at all?

Nephew. Truly I thinke it impossible, both because I never heard of any nation that had no Religion at all, no not the Caniballs: as also because I have heard that absurde Religions have continued from father to sonne for many generations together, and never left vntill another Religion was brought in, and then too with much adoe, the people being loth to be drawn from their former beliefe. Yea if one should confidently saie the contrarie, I doe not know how to convince him.

why all people have some Religion.

Vncle. You must looke into the causes which make men Religious, & if you finde the

vs how vniuersall and perpe-
tuall you may be sure that all
sortes of Peoples haue some
Religion in the, though more
or lesse according as the Lea-
ders are more or lesse in force
amongst them. But let vs
knowe, can you tell me what
is Religion in generall, as it is
common to both true and
false?

What is Religion in generall.

Mephostophilis. I imagine Reli-
gion to be a conceite or per-
suasion of the people concer-
ning one, or more, excellent
natures which gouerne huma-
ne life, giuing vs those goods
which of our selues we cannot
attaine vnto, and inflicting vpō
vs those paines wherof we
doe not knowe the causes.
And this persuasion reacheth
also to the manner and forme

of pleasing this or these Gouernors and commanders, whereby to obtaine *goods* and eschew *euills*. And the reason why I make this conceite of Religion is, because I see these things are in all sorts of Religion, and all authours which write of the Religion of what nation soeuer touch cheefely these pointes.

Which be the causes of Religiõ, and Why it cannot perish.

Vncle. Your remarque is good, and if you looke into your definition you shall finde the causes of Religion. You saie Religion is a conceite of the Gouernors of man's life in giftes and punishments, whose causes we doe not knowe. Then you see Religion must needes be a *faith*, for when we doe not know things, we cannot make anie conceite of the

but by beleeving and trusting others whom we thinke know the things that we know not, and therefore Religion in generall is taken vpon trust. Father, you saie that Religion is a methode of pleasing those Gouernors, whereby to get goods, and eschew euills, so that the desire of goods, and the feare of euills, are the authors and causes of Religion, we haue then *hope* and *feare* for the *willingnesse* and *aduantage of an vnlearned man's knowledge* for the *vnderstanding*, which be the parents of Religion. Now thinke you, colen, can these causes be defective and fayling in anie age?

Eraſmus. Surely they cannot. For if were no generation of men, but beasts, that were to

doliſh and fooliſh as to ſee ſo many *goods* and *harmes*, which happen to all men wee know not whence, and thinke that there were no cauſe thereof. And therefore it is the moſt eaſie and moſt naturall conceite that man can haue, to conceiue that ſome thing is the cauſe of theſe goods and hurtes. Now man's converſation being cheefely with one an other, men naturally apprehende all things to be donne by ſome *underſtanding thing*, as they ſee their owne actions are, ſo that if there were a compagnie of men ſprung out of the earth, like Cadmus his people, or railed out of emmits, like the Myrmidons, yet would they (if they were truly men) within a little while frame

them selues some Religion, according as by chance, or for me one's apprehension or phantasie they should conceite their goods and euills to proceede from some visible or invisible thing. Wherefore I admire not that some people adored the sunne, some the starrs, others some rare men from whom they had receiued in their life time great benefits, imagining that euen after death they were power full and beneficiall. And surely it is much more impossible that a people which once hath had some Religion, should quitte forget it, and come to haue none at all, for these causes will be euer knocking at their harts, putting them in minde, and driuing them into the conceite

of some God or Gouernor, if therefore the effects of perpetuall causes must be euerlasting, these causes of Religion (to wit, *effects whose causes are hidden*, and *the good and euill which come vnto vs by them*) being neuer awanting, it is impossible that Religion should euer cease.

Vncle. And thinke you not, cosen, that these same causes doe as well moue those who are setled in a faith or Religion to continue without changing their once receiued beliefe, as well I saie, as they doe keepe them, from forgetting that Religion which they are once possessed of?

Nephew. I confesse it seeme's euident to me, that the change of Religion can not

come by pure negligence and sleepinesse, no more then the losse of it, being these warnings of nature which force vs to Religion doe also continually call vpon vs to keepe our once practized faith and credulitie, vnlesse there be greater causes to counterman-de it, which I doe not see but may be easily found some times.

Vnde. Peraduenture not so easily as you imagine, for an Errour is a perswasion of the minde. And nothing can worke vpon our vnderstanding but it self, and our will, who soeuer therefore will make such a perswasion must worke vpon one of these two. The will you know is moued and wielded by hopes and feares,

How error in bredin man.

the vnderstanding by reason and authoritie. Whence arise three waies by which such an opinion may creepe into mens mindes. 1. by bringing some reason for it, the ca be brought on the contrarie side, 2. by the authoritie of some so great as that their verdicts are held beyond examining, and 3. by the power of some whose hands are full of paines and pleasures, and who can thereby move the *will*, which being moved can make the vnderstanding believe what she listeth. Doe you know anie other meanes?

Nephew. Not I, vncle, for I see that if I should bring anie other, you would referre it to some of these three. But me thinke such an opinion might

steale vpon the church as vn-
awares, some obscure man
broaching it at the first, and
others accepting of it by a
kinde of negligence and indif-
ferencie to anie opinion, or by
too much credulitie, not di-
stinguishing right from wrong,
though I see this touches some-
what vpon authoritie, and
so will be reduced to that me-
ber of your diuision.

It importes not to
what member it be reduced so
there be no fourth waie. But
though you had learned sufi-
ciently already to exclude
this, for what makes more no-
tice to be taken of anie thing,
then that, which changeth for-
mer publicke and vniuersall
practise? Looke but if anie
one goe through the streete,

in some strang and new fashi-
oned apparell, how all stare
and gaze vpon him, the verie
boys leaue their playe to fol-
low him and looke at him.
And therefore to saie such an
Innouation can be brought in
without being taken notice of,
is as much as to saie, the cause
of admiration or taking no-
tice can be set before our eyes
without working it's effect.
Which is to saie, that fire and
tow should lye together with-
out burning, or a stone hang at
libertie in the aire without fal-
ling downe: there be impossi-
bilities in nature, and are in
the racke of those things aga-
inst which nature followeth
by his continuall causes of ho-
pes and feares, which made
you confesse but now, that ne-

ligence was not a sufficient cause to produce the change of Religion. Wherefore let vs see if by anie of these three waies which I haue proposed the change of Religion can happen.

Nephew. Nay, sir, I will doe you the fauour to exclude one of them, to wit, the waie of persuasion, or by alledging more reason against the true Religion, then can be brought for it, for seing truth beare witnesse to one another, and that the Religion we speake of is supposed to be true, it is impossible that more reason should be brought against it, then for it. Nor is the greatnesse of anie man's wit, who should stand to maintaine the error, to be feared, for this error being to pal-

so through a great part of the world, 'tis not credible that one man should so far surpasse in wit the rest of the world as to put them all from their reading without contradiction. Or that in so much time as is necessarie for the spreading of such an error into the maine of the church, no man should haue wit enough, if not to bring more potent arguments for the truth, at least to finde out the weakenesse and fallacie of those which are brought against it, which would be sufficient to hinder the progresse of such an error; for who is in possession of an opinion would haue an inuolable reason to put him out of it, if he be wise and constant. Much more those who grounde their *armis*

vnion receiuing them from their forefathers, and should all reason insufficient to proue their faith, because of its supernaturalitie, and therefore ought more to hearken to what was deliuered, then to any reason which may seeme to vrge the change of what is knowne to be deliuered. Thus much I confesse is cleere, but why the authoritie of some one, or more, whose words are aboue examine, or the power of some who holds the balance of good and badd, of paines and pleasures, may not worke in error into the church, that I doe not vnderstand.

Pride. You haue drawne the question from an vniuersall to a particular, for we spoke of a change betwixt two Religions

in common, and you speake of a change from a true one to a false one. Yet this being sufficient for our intent, I will adde that if you had that conceite of the true Religion, which much thought hath bredd in me, to wit, that it is the most high, wise, rationall, conformable to man's nature, to gouerment, to all things fitting for man's life, that can be imagined, of all disciplines and learnings possible, that it leadeth into greater secrets of nature, then otherwise we should ever reach vnto, and exceedeth all the knowledge which made antient and moderne sages so proud, I say you had, I saie, this conceite of the true Religion you would be much more confirmed and streng-

thened in this perſuasion. But why doe you not thinke it impoſſible that the authoritie of one man ſhould ouerſwaye all the witts of the world? Surely the Diuill him ſelfe would rather helpe the church then permitte ſo litle pride amongſt me. Neuer yet anie great man wanted his Antagoniſt, who had he ſuch a ſtaye in is credit as this our ſubiect would giue him, it would quickly hinder the extent of his authoritie. Not anie of our neuer ſo much eſteemed fathers is receiued in all things, nor is anie of their authorities receiued in ſuch an eminent height, as is neceſſarie for the effect we ſpeake of. Who was greater then Origen? And yet was he

condemned euen whe he was
in greateſt vogue. But I needs
not appeale to examples whe-
re nature by it's owne force
ſtrikes the ſtroke. For eue
this new doctrine is brought
in openly by the ſtrong and
earneſt endeauours of the au-
thor himſelf (whoſe authori-
tie muſt ſway the world) and
of his followers. And then by
this verie negotiation it will
diſcouer it's newnesse, and
being falſe the more it is hid-
ked the more it will ſhew it's
weaknesse, and at length goe
out like a mufle of it ſelf. Or
elſe it comes in neglectedly,
being written by the *Iye*, and
the Innouator's authoritie
vrged by others vpon occa-
ſion: and then the verie man-
ner beares with it ſo little like-

ly hood and small efficacitie as that it would be euerie where checkked by reason of it's newnesse, and therefore could neuer passe vncontrowled through anie great extent. And if we put the case, as before, to be in the Catholike church, where the truth is not to be handled by learned reasons, as being aboue nature, but by what our forefathers haue taught vs, you see this great man's authoritie presently vanisheth into smoake, being there's no place for anie man's authoritie, where the constant and vniuersall verdict of the present world is against it, in ripe & whereof he is but a single man. Concerning force or power you must suppose, before you can make anie ap-

parent argument of it, 1. that this power is over the whole Christian world, 2. to be so strong that it feareth not to giue distaste to the people, 3. to be vehemently desirous to quell the ould faith and bring in a new one, 4. that it hath zealous ministers for the same end. And lastly that all these dare and do continue vntill all the antient faith be extinct. And when all is done yet will it remaine vpon record and be knowne when this new opinion began, and the violence being ended there's a roote in men's harts to reiect this new opinion and returne to the old, supposing as we do there's more reason for the old then for the new. So that in common sense and nature's

principles the Pope had iuſt cauſe to write to the Emperor in theſe termes:

Nitris auiſum nunc ſub-
mergere petris,
Fluctibus, & tumidis mergitur
illa vadis.

But to conclude this point, tell me, Eolen, what time thinke you is neceſſarie for the introducing of an error by hide and hide before it will paſſe for a thing deliuered by hand to hand from Chriſt? For ſuch an opinion we call a Treaſon.

Eolen. I ſee it muſt gaine the reputation you ſpeake of by making it quite forgotten that the other opinion was euer ther generally held & practized. For as long as it is knowne that the other opinion was antient, they ſhall in vaine

doubt

which

which will refute, also in re-
[illegible] the preceding [illegible]
[illegible] and that the fallen side
[illegible] antient and consequent-
[illegible] there will [illegible] be euidence
[illegible] was an other faith
[illegible] doctrine, deliuered by the
Apostles before this came vp,
which in deede ought to be
[illegible]

Then coſen, let vs
put 600 yeares to be ſufficient
for ſuch an extinction, (which
[illegible] great a circuit, and for a
[illegible] rooted in mens harts
and practized in their actions
[illegible] a [illegible] time) and ioyne
thereto the 4. or 600 we ſpeake
of. And conſidere whe-
ther ame violent mutation ca
[illegible] againſt nature for 6. or
600 yeares, be either of 4 y-

rannie, authoritie, or what other occasion soeuer, and this to oppresse the true faith grounded in nature. Might we not as well saie there would be perpetuall faire weather for manie yeares together through a great part of the world, as that there should be such a perpetuall disposition against reason and our naturall inclination to the vtter ruine and ouerthrow of our euerie where receiued faith?

Nephew. You haue reason vncle. For although when I considere the mutabilitie of mankinde alone, and contriue with my self how this might be effected, it seeme's plausible to saie that another opinion might come in and

when I deepely weigh what you fate against it, and ballance the one with the other, I see my frame is limited within a finite compasse and few yeares, but reacheth not to the vnlimitable and generall Dominion or Gouernment of nature. For I could make the like argument for not raining, blowing, shyning and the like, that is in decade, for the destruction of nature. And I doe not thinke you intende to make the church stronger then the pillars of nature, on which it standes. We ought not therefore to esteeme nature vniuersally defectible, because we cannot reach to see fully how euerie particular encumbrance is auoided, for it is not that

causes are not certaine and infallible; but that my discourse comprehendes them not.

Vnite. I doe not in deede intende to make the strength of faith greater, the the strength of nature, though perhapps I could, supposing (which is certaine) that nature was created and built for the supernaturall guifts and goods which God bestowes vpon it, they which being greater and better then nature, it is fitting they should haue stronger maintenance and holds then nature it self; And therefore it is likely that nature is strengthened by principles and fundations aboue it's pitch, to the end it may be a fit and sure proppe of faith and supernaturall guifts. But this point concer-

why faith is stronger then nature.

no's not our prefent dil courfe.

Nephew. I confeffe I doe clearely fee that the Chriſtian church hath conſerued it ſelf from error, ſuppoſing that the Paſtors and Gouernors of it haue carefully taken notice from time to time of their forefather's doctrine; and I am beholden to you for this reaſon. But may not the church haue beene neglected herein? Though I fcarcely haue courtage enough to aske you this queſtion, for I ſee you will anſwere me that nature muſt needes haue it's recourſe, and that howſoeuer at ſome times or places it may haue defects, yet muſt it of neceſſitie at other times and in other places haue it's returnes, and freſhly renew it's care and be follici-

tous of so great a good, which cannot but fall out once within 500. yeares, that is within the terme prefixed wherein she may discouer the doctrine of hir forefathers constantly held and generally deliuered to be the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles. Nevertheless if you could shew me that the church had in effect so construed it selfe, I should be more able to conuince a peruerse opponent and demonstrate.

§. 8. *That the truth of Christian doctrine hath actually continued in the church.*

VNCLE. Is it possible you should be so vnreasonable as to aske me to proue a

thing which depends of mans will: yet that you may see how great the workes of Almightie God are, and how nothing is so variable but that he can fixe and make it constant, I will endeauour to let you vnderstand as much as my self in this point, so you will be attentiue and raise a right your vnderstanding to answere me in the waie of rigorous discourse, which you haue some experience in, by the mathematickes you haue tasted. Tell me then doe you thinke, that if ame great congregation of men now living hold this maxime for their faith and Religion, *that nothing* is to be held for certaine and as a reuealed truth, but what they haue receiued fro their forefathers as a thing

deliuered by hand to hand from the Apostles. And that whatsoeuer is not so succeded is not immutable but may be altered if reason commaund. doe you thinke I saie, that this Congregation could in this our age haue begunne to hold this maxime? or that as they receiued the rest of their doctrine from their forefathers, they must not also haue receiued this *newes*?

Nephew. Truly I cannot tell you, for me thinke it were absurde to receiue all the rest from their forefathers & take this of new, which is the rule of all the rest; yet I doe not see it so cleerely as that I am able to conuince that it is so.

Vncle. Why, cosen, let vs

put the case that there were a
Generall Councell of all Chri-
stendome sitting for example
in the yeare 1600. And after
much disputation about fin-
ding a rule to serue matters of
Religion, they should agree,
that to receiue nothing but
what had bene deliuered vn-
to them by hand to hand frō
Christ and his Apostles, were
the best waie to end all dispu-
tations of Religion, and there-
vpon decree, that hereafter
nothing should be held for
certaine and immutable, but
what were so receiued: And
that amongst these Bishops
one should rise vp and make
this difficultie, we cannot
know that anie thing is recei-
ued by hand to hand from
Christ vnlesse our forefathers

who liued in the last age can not haue deliuered vnto vs as such, which they cannot haue deliuered vnto vs but by one of these two waies, either because we know they had this same principle, which we seeke here to settle, (to wit, that they tooke nothing for immutably certaine and of faith but what was so deliuered vnto them) And then we know what soeuer they haue deliuered vnto vs for a matter of faith, was likewise receiued by them, or at least they thought it to be receiued in the same manner, and therefore we may be confident of it: Or else they must haue declared vnto vs what is so receiued, what not, that the one part may be accepted by vs, and established

as matters of faith, the other held in leſſe eſteeme and as no points of faith. This ſecond we know hath not beene done, And therefore if our forefathers had not this principle, how ſhould we haue it? For if they had it not and haue deliuered our doctrine and Religio vnto vs without diſtinctio, we muſt of neceſſitie accept euen for Religion, faith, and as receiued fro Chriſt, which we know not whether it was ſo or no, And therefore wee muſt either wilfully deceiue our ſelues and our ſucceſſors accounting and eſteeming things which were neuer receiued from Chriſt to haue beene receiued from him, and to falſly deliuer them for ſuch to our ſucceſſors, and conſe-

quietly ground both our faith and theirs vpon this vntruth, that our *rites* were receiued from Christ. Or else we must content our selues as our forefathers haue done, and seeke no new ground of ending controuersies in Religion. If one, I saie, should make this difficultie in that graue Assemblie, would it not puzzell them all, and put them of from their resolution?

Nephew. Truly, vncle, it could not chuse, vnlesse they were obstinately resolued to damne thē selues and all their posteritie, and that impudently in the sight of the whole world, which would reproach them with so notorious an imposture. Nor can I imagine how such a position though

once beginne should take roote. The whole world being able to see & detecte the indignitie of it. And because I foresee your drift, I will graunt you may frame the same argument for anie age, and consequently there is no age in which this reformation could haue beene first taken vp, but only *in such an one*, in which it was electerly known what the Apostles taught and what they did not by witnesse from those who had their doctrine from their owne mouthes, that is, the verie next age after the Apostles. So that we may euidently conclude that a church which now holdeth with vniuersall consent this principle, which you speake of, must of necessitie haue held the same from the next

age after the Apostles.

Vncle. But can you now tell me, cosen, whether this congregatio as long as it adheres to this principle can receiue anie thing of this nature and qualitie cōtrarie to what their forefathers deliuered vnto the vpon this same principle? And note, I pray, I doe not aske whether they can receiue anie thing but what they apprehend to be so: but I aske whether they can receiue anie thing as such, but that which truly is so deliuered, thats, whether they can be cosened in this question,

Whether their forefathers deliuered it vnto them or no.

Nephew. It is euident they cannot. For although one may be deceiued in what is tould him, specially at one ti-

me, yet to saie whole nations are deceiued in what is tould the, not once or twice, but what they are bredd and beate to, is as much as to saie all men are deceiued in iudging white frō blacke, because, for sooth, some weake eyes are now and thē mistaken, or as to saie, no bodie can walke, because some haue the palsey which were in deede to destroye nature and it's constancie in vniuersalls, because of it's defectibilitie in it's particulars, which is against common sense and reason.

Vncle. Well then doe you thinke their immediate forefathers could reach thē anie thing as of this qualitie but what themselues believed and had receiued in the same manner?

Neph. No surely, their immediate forefathers could not deliuer anie thing as of this nature to their successors against the doctrine which they had receiued from their predecessours, euer standing in this principle, that nothing is to be beleiued as of necessitie in this degree but what came by hand to hand frō Christ or his Apostles.

Vncle. Tell me then, I pray, whether in the two last points, that is, whether either we can be deceiued in what was deliuered by our immediate forefathers vnto vs as of this kinde, or they deliuer vs anie doctrine as of this qualitie but what them selues receiued in the like sort, whether I. faile in either of these two points there

he anie difference betwixt anie former age and this our present age or than what you haue granted of this age, the same muſt not neceſſarily hold in all other ages euer ſince Chriſt.

Nephew. I confeſſe I ſee noe difference.

Uncle. Reflect then vpon what you haue granted, and conſidere whether anie error against a receiued doctrine & practice of this nature could ſo creepe in, as that there ſhould be no determinate age of it's beginning, in which it firſt tooke roote and flouriſhed?

Nephew. 'Tis not poſſible that anie thing ſhould beginne and yet beginne in no time. For I conceiue that an age is no ſmale time & giue's no lit-

le growth to anie thing that beginne's, so that to faie anie point of doctrine is a whole age in growing, ād to faie with all it is imperceptible, and after a whole age vnsensible, is without doubt sensleſſe. Yet if anie should saie that an error had beene begun by a priuate man and taught to some in one age, which being neglected grew into practize in some one countrie, and frō thēce by the like neglect grew likewise to be customarie in the next adioyning, and so spredd it self vntil it had possessed the hart of Christendome, and this for manie yeares, so that now all memorie that euer the contrarie had beene in credit and practize were loſt, if this, I saie, one should

tell me, I doubt whether I should be able to giue him a conuincing answere and demonstratiue satisfaction.

Vncle. Cosen, this question reacheth vpon what we haue alreadie talked of, therefore I will only giue you such a hint as your self may worke vpon. First it is as manifest an impossibilitie that a change of Religion should be introduced insensibly into anie one Countrie, as that a burning feaver should for as long time consume the same whole countrie without being taken notice of, or sought to be prevented, sithence as we saide nature permit's vs not generally to be sleepie in Religion. Secondly to saie it shall passe imperceptible from country

to countries and so get possession of the whole Christian world is farr more impossible, men's natures and dispositions being so diuers that if they were put to weare cappes or shoes alike is could not be effected but by some publicke force or commande. Thirdly that this should be for so long a terme that no certaine phrase should be quite forgotte to haue been formerly in vse and request is yet beyond both. So that whosoeuer is troubled with this doubt doth not rightly vnderstand the nature of Christian Religion, which is a truth of the qualitie of science hanging all together. Whereunto a truth may be added and yet remaine whole, but if anie falsitie or crosse position

be admitted, it will not only destroy the positiō immediatly oppositue, but also what soeuer dependeth of it, that is, all in deede but cheefely tradition. And so we see by experience that none euer moued any point of faith, but if their resolutions log, they proceed so fare, as to take a vaine *tradition* the rule of all we are to beleeue. But can you tell me, haue we reached to the resolution of your demande ād are you fully satisfied?

Nephew. This you haue concluded that if our church rely vpon traditiō now, it euer did so; And if it euer did rely vpon tradition it must needes haue maintained the same doctrine from Christ's time to ours, for neither could

ane former age deliuer ane thing contrarie to what they had receiued vpon this principle. nor we miſtake what they deliuered; ſo that nothing contrarie to the firſt receiued doctrine can be admitted. This yet, me thinke's, wateth, To ſhew what the preſent Roman church rely's vpon tradition, which I confeſſe to me is euident, at leaſt that what ſoeuer we haue receiued frō our forefathers as comming by hand to hand from Chriſt, that we reuerence and receiue all ſuch pointes as being neceſſarie to be believed. Only I haue one ſcruple wherein I muſt craue your helpe, And it is Whether this *rule of tradition* which you giue to be ſo conſtantly held to be the *rule of*

faith, whether I faie, it be to
mitted of by all Catholikes
or no, for I feare the varietie
of contrarie opinions which I
heare are amongst our learned,
mun will preiudice your argu-
mes. Wherefore I could wish
you would shew me

That the dissension of Catholike Doctors concerning the rule of faith doth not hurt the certaintie of Tradition. §. 9.

BVt I am tould (how true I
know not) that some of our
Deuines maintaine that in the
person of the Pope reside's
the rule of faith, by a singular
guift and priuiledge bestowed
vpon S. Peeter and his succes-
sors. And this so rigorously
that no Generall Councell, no

not although the Pope's Legates be present and confirme it, is of force to oblige to *faith* vntill the personall confirmation of his Holinesse be obtained. Others, they say, esteeme the Councell above the Pope, and so doe not hold the Pope's approbation of a Councell to be necessarie, but that this rule of faith resides in the Councell. Others I heare, to make all safe, ioyne both in one, and neither admit the Councell without the Pope, nor the Pope without the Councell to breede ane obligation of faith. And farther I heare that amongst these Doctors, of what opinion soeuer they be touching the subiect in which this *rule* or *highest authoritie* doth reside,

there

there be some which thinke that not anie *new* doctrine or position can be broached or proposed as certaine and as an article of faith by what authoritie soeuer, vnlesse that doctrine was esteemed certaine before, and euer believed as such. Yet I am tould there be manie who maintaine and auouch that *this highest authoritie* of the church (whersoeuer it be) may and can define points of doctrine not certainely knowne hitherto, nor euer expressly believed before. Which how they may be reconciled amongst them selues or stand with this, *that tradition is our rule of faith*, I confesse I know not.

Vnde. Truly, cozen, your objection is strong, yet I hope

to content you. For the first part of it, I see no great matter in the varietie of opinions amongst our Deuines, for you see they seeke out the Decrees of pointes of doctrine, that is by whose mouth we are to know, (vpon occasions of dispute) what and which be our pointes and articles of faith, to wit, whether the Pope, or the Councell, or both. Which is not much materiall to our pourpose, what euer the truth be, supposing we acknowledge no articles of faith but such as haue descended vnto vs by tradition from Christ and his Apostles. The second part of your obiection seemes to be of greater force, because some Deuines seeme to acknowledge an authoritie in the church

which hath power, not only to determine either speculatiue or practicall points of doctrine new, or ould, in such manner as that the whole church is obliged to accepte or not oppose it's definition, (which euerie Catholike grante's, and the reasons I tould you in our first conference doe euidently conuince) But also that this authoritie can so determine euen a speculatiue pointe of doctrine, which hitherto was euer vncertaine nor euer acknowledge as reuelled, or esteemed as an article of faith, that here after the whole church shalbe obliged to receiue, acknowledge, and believe it as a reuealed and necessarie point of Christian doctrine, and as an article of faith.

Which opinion you must knowe, is but an opinion, not doe the authours of it oblige anie man to believe it as certaine, not doe they condemne those who nether doe, nor euer will acknowledge anie such positiō, ād therefore this ought not to trouble you. Nay contrariwise all Deuines will generally tell you, that no new articles of faith can be made, that there's now no reuelations for new points of doctrine, and that Christ Iesus was our only law maker in this kinde, hauing suggested to his Apostles all that is necessarie of this nature and qualitie, and the Apostles likewise taught their churches all that was necessarie to be knowne of this degree. Wherefore you

see all agree vpon *tradition*, nor anie one ether denie it, or doubt of it, Whereas it appeares by the diuersitie of their opinions that they doe not vniuersally and generally agree to anie other meanes or rule of faith, though some admitte of another in vaie of opinion. Yet to giue you farther satisfaction in this busines, I will teach you a point of philosophie which perhapps you neuer fully vnderstood. I am sure you will not denie but is a different question to aske how an herbe or tree groweth, and to aske how Aristole or Theophrastus saies it groweth, for in the same growing there can be no varietie but in their opinions there may. So in man, it is a different thing,

what he doth or is done in him, and what he thinkes he doth or is done in him, as in ſickneſſe, diſgeſtion, and other naturall workes it is euident, yea and in voluntary actions too, Which depende of corporall inſtruments, as to goe, runne, turne our eyes, ſpeake, cough, ſpit or the like, which we doe freely and voluntarily, yet were we examined by what inſtruments and motios we doe thē, peraduēture who ſeeme's to know moſt would be found ſhort, at leaſt amongſt manie there would be diuers opinions. But doe you thinke the ſame happen's in our thoughts and iudgmēts which be purely ſpirituall?

Nephew. I cannot tell yet methinke's the ſoule ſhould be ſo wel acquainted with hir

owne actiõs as that she should no neede anie helpe to know them. And all men agree that only man vpon earth can see his owne minde, and therefore if it be non cleere to man what him selfe thinke's, nothing is cleere.

Vncle. You are deceiued cosen, for as long as we are in this world we cannot know anie thing of our owne thoughts and affections but as we reflect vpon the corporall motions which accompanie them, and which because none feele but our selues, none can knowe but our selues, though sometimes it happene's quite contrarie, when these motiõs breake forth into outward apparence, for thẽ others discrye our mindes, and we our selues

through the violēce of passiō are not so vvel able to iudge of them as others vvho see vs. But to speake of men free from passion, and vvho vse to reflect much vpon their owne thoughts, euen in them their internall actions proceede nō a principle directed by a superior guide then their owne reason, as appeares by this that they know nothing of their owne thoughts but by reflection, and the reflection is a distinct act from the former vpon which the reflectiō is made, so that nether the reflectiō it self is alwaise made by voluntarie designe, nor anie act which is made without reflection. Besides considere, I pray, how few know by what vertue their vnderstandings

are made certaine of those principles and positiõs which they cannot doubt of, or by what vertue they adhere so strongly to the conclusion of a sylogisme, not one of a thousand who doe these things euerie day. Wherefore 't is euident that euen in our spirituall actions, not all that we doe is done by our proper vnderstanding, that is, with knowing reflection and designe, and therefore, the same man may euen in these intellectuall acts doe one thing and thinke he doth another, and diuers men may agree in what they doe, and yet disagree in their opinions of what it is they doe. And now to close with your difficultie, seeing faith is a persuasion or an agreeing in some

points by reaſon nat authoritie. All the Doctors of the Catholike church may agree in beleeuing, that is, in acting and practizing their faith in the ſame manner, and yet be deuided in their ſpeculations by which they ſeeke to determine what it is they doe, And it is their doeings which make's them Chriſtians and not their ſayings: for they liue and beleeue as Chriſtians, but ſpeake and deliuer their opinions as Doctors, which be qualities farr different from being a Chriſtian. And doe you not ſee that theſe Doctors, beleeue after their ſpeculations and framing of their opinions as they did before they thought of, or ſtudied this difficultie?

Nephew. I doe not doubt

but they doe, for the faith of all Christians must needes be the same, and consequently all must goe vpon the same motiue, though one may vnderstand better and apprehende deeper that motiue then an other doth.

Vncle. You saie well, Considere then that when these Doctors were yong men, and had not yet studied Diuinitie, and you shall finde that they had no other motiue of their belife but the authoritie of the present church, and therefore how soeuer they discourse learnedly in their bookes, the conclusion must be in their liues to rest vpon the authoritie of the present church as before they did.

Nephew. Nay if you goe that

waie to worke I feare you will fall short of your intent. For the child beleeues his father and mother, the parishoner his Pastor without reflection of the present church. 'Tis like therefore these Deuines rely vpō the motiues which they maintaine what soeuer they did when they were yong.

Vncle. Not so neither, for as the water of the new riuer which is brought to London come's to a particular house by a smale pipe, yet 't is comminuate to the whole bodie of the riuer: so the instruction of faith though it come to a child by his parents and to a parishoner by his Pastor, yet the dependence of the doctrine is from the whole church, whose members and instruments

these parents and Pastors are, if they be in the church, to which you know I tould you what is requited. And t'is the like when parents teach their children, what is to be done or avoided according to the lawes of the coutry, for though the father speake, yet t'is the common wealth which premaleth and bindeth.

Nephew. At leaſt me thinkes, vncle, ſuch great Doctors ſhould not be ignorant of a point agreed vpon by the whole church, and therefore ſince they diſagree about the motiue of faith, I doe not ſee how you can ſaie t'is generally agreed on in the Catholike church.

Vncle. Had this agreemēt beene made in a Generall

Counsell, or in some vniuersall meeting of faithfull Christians, and so recorded, I doubt not but these learned Clarkes would haue knowne it; but it was not so agreed on. Yet as by the vniuersall blessing of *Crescite & multiplicamini*, all men and beasts agreed vpon feeding and filling the world, euerie one in his kinde, by the direction of their maker, knocking at their stomackes when they were hungrie, and at their phansie when they were full to set on worke those instruments by which these commands of Almightie God were to be fulfilled: Euen so by the like blessing of *Eunte in mundum vniuersum praedicate omni creaturæ*, the Apostles being dispersed into all nations

Gen. 1.

Marc. 16

by the vertue of doeing miracles found credulitie, or rather forced faith out of the flintie harts of the corrupted world, and hauing setled Christs doctrine, dying left in their successors soules and mindes this agreement. To beleiue what was deliuered from them, and to trust those who had heard them speake, and afterwards to trust those who had heard it from them who had their instruction from the Apostles, and lastly to trust the publike consent which affirmed that they held their faith by entaile from them though manie ages after. This agreement being written in harts and not in bookes, it is easie for learned men who seeke their learning in bookes and not in harts

to mistake. As in Philosophie, whilest great Clarkes seeke nature, not in it self, but in other men's sayings, they are deuided, and few in the right, the truth being but one.

Nephew. You haue beene as good as you word. For I see it importe's not, that our Diuines be of different opinions in this point, so that in their liues and practize they agree. And truly I neuer heard of anie Catholike, that euer doubted, but that Christian doctrine was descended by Tradition, or thought that what was so descended could be false, nay I think euerie moderate and wise Protestant will make no question of that which he conceiues to haue descended from the Apostles

by succession. For Catholikes vse all rely vpon the censure of the present church, nor can anie man appeale frō it and call him self a Catholike, for we all account them infidels and publicans who are refractorie to this tenet. Wherfore it is euident that what soeuer the church speake's and deliuer's for Tradition, is agreed vpon by all Catholikes to be certaine and vnrefusable, and hithence all other motiues or rules of faith are not vniuersally receiued, t'is euident likewise that this is the rule which can oblige vs to certaintie in matters of beliefe. But I haue an other great difficultie, to wit, that I see our Catechists and preachers, whē they teach vs Christian do-

ctrine, tell vs, this you are to beleeue, this you are to practize, without expressing the differences which are betwixt the points of doctrine, whereof perhapps some are but only the answeres of learned men, some definitiõs of the church, and some, matters of traditiõ. And the like I beleeue of former ages, Christian doctrine descending vnto vs in a heape or confusion, and therefore tis hard to distinguish what is of Tradition, what the generall consent of the church, and what only learned men's opinions. Why then may not some position of this last ranke passe for a tradition by the adoption of some ages, in which it will be forgotten that euer it had it's beginning frõ

the wit and industrie of priuate men? And to satisfie me in this point you must let me see how that.

The teaching of Christian doctrine without determining what is of necessitie to be beleiued what not, barres not the progresse of tradition.

VNcle. If I should answere you, that former ages haue beene more exact in distinguishing things certaine from vncertaine it would not be without ground, as you may see by the framing of antient creedes and other professions of faith as occasions required, but this were to send you to antiquitie, whereas in this discourse you know we both desire that common sense and reason without farther

enquiry should be our iudge. Wherefore the point you speake of, which you feare might deceiue vs by the likenesse of tradition, is either true or false, if true, then I pray, what inconuenience is there, if it impugne vs in the qualitie of it's certaintie?

Neph. v. This I feare and thinke, that it would breake the rule and certaintie of tradition. Where vpon (I) we's the whole building and frame of our faith according to your discourse. For if once vnwritten deliuered by tradition may passe for so deliuered, what securitie can we haue that a falsitie may not likewise passe in the same manner, and so bring an errour amongst vs?

Vnde. I put you only that

part of the question, *if the point were true*, which you draw into the consequence, *if it were false*, wherefore if it doe not follow that an vntruth can deceiue vs in that kinde, then there is no inconuenience in the consequence of the former part, to wit, that truth may be taken as deliuered by tradition, which truly is not so deliuered. And the reason is cleare, for seeing the truths of Religion are knowne for the framing of our liues conformably vnto them, in respect of vertue, vpon what grounds they are held in particular, so they be vniuersally and constantly held, for an action done in consequence of such beleiued truths is neuer the worse for the qualitie of the

certaintie of it's obiect. Yet for your farther satisfaction this I will adde, that how soeuer the common people doe not distinguish what is of Tradition, and what is but of some learned men's opinios, neuertheleſſe thoſe whom we call Deuines (if truly they be such as the name require's) may and doe distinguish poſitions of such different natures. For Christian doctrine is not a bundle of loose poſitions (as those who negligently looke on it may thinke) but a true diſcipline hanging together by conſequences and order tending to one end. And of this doctrine and diſcipline some parts be such as cannot be knowne but by immediate reuelation, others such as no

ſenſible man can doubt of, if he beleeue the former. And learned men know that of both theſe two, the one is expreſſly deliuered by tradition, the other is as firme as if it were ſo deliuered. For as it was reueiled that our Sauiour is truly God and man, ſo euerie man of comon ſenſe knowes that he had two *wills*, *Deuine* and *human*, againſt the Monothelites. Other points there may be which neede art and ſtudie to deduce and fetch them out of the two former. And of theſe likewiſe a true Deuine cannot be ignorat, being they are be fruits of learning and ſtudie, and conſequently haue euer beene in the ſoules and writings of learned Maſters. And theſe points euerie one

knowes who is conuerſant in Logike, and in iudging the qualities of ſuch propoſitions as belong to ſcience. And your ſelf I am ſure by the litle skill you haue therein, and by the ſmale light of this diſcourſe, will eaſily iudge that this is reaſonable.

Nephew. I conceiue your meaning, but whereas you ſaie that the points of the ſecond order are as firme as thoſe which are deliuered by *Tradition*, me thinke's that's not reaſonable, ſithence *Tradition* relye's wholy on God and his word, but the other only vpo man's diſcourſe which is faliible and eaſily miſtaken, and therefore muſt of neceſſitie be much inferior.

Vncle. I would not haue you take

take my words so precisely, nor in so rigorous a degree of comparison, for so euen of demonstrations the precedent will be esteemed more certaine then that which is deduced out of it, though in a morall estimation the certainties be equall. And so it is in those two degrees, for truly that little discourse which is required for the second degree is infallible, certaine, and euident, and therefore the knowledge proceeding from it may well be ranched with the former degree. But I suppose you expect to heare why it doth not follow, that if a truth not deliuered by Tradition may nevertheless passe for such, why, I saie, an errour may not haue the same progresse, and surprise the

church that is.

Why no error can passe vniuer-
§. 11. *sally through the churches of God.*

AND this I will shew you in a word, because it falleth into the repetition of what we haue already discoursed on. The impossibilities are three. First it trencheth vpon the resolution we formerly made that one man's authoritie could not prenaile against, and ouer the whole church: for this is the difference betwixt a truth and a false hood, that a truth though it beginne from one yet may it be accepted of by all, by reason of it's euidence. Which when one hath laid open, others may follow, not for the man's authoritie, but for the loue of the

seene truth: Whereas falsehood, which cannot bring euidence with it, must be bolstered vp by the man's credit ād reputation, which you know is insufficient. Secondly it is impossible an errour should generally preuaile by reason of the immutabilitie which is in the vniuersalitie of contingent causes, whose particulars may be defectiue, but the vniuersalls cannot. So that as it is impossible in nature that all children should be borne with one eye, all colts with three legges, or the like, so were it a monstrous accident, and that in a higher and more immutable nature, if an errour should generally preuaile and passe through all mankinde, or through so great a part of it as

we make accounte the Catholike church is, and will euer be. The third impossibilitie is, because it trencheth vpon the stabilitie of Religion, for sithence we agreed that t'is impossible for anie nation to haue no Religion, and as impossible to change a true into a false, And likewise that Christian doctrine hath the nature of science, so farre as that no errour can fall into it but must bring contradiction and opposition against the principles and receiued practize of the church, and so make a breach against the antient possession, it doth therefore plainely appeare, that as it is impossible for such a breach to become vniuersall in time and place, so likewise must it needes be

impossible that an vntruth should be vniuersally receiued for *tradition*, hauing not beene deliuered as such.

Nephew. I must confesse your reasons seeme good, yet might one saie all your reasons are but morall persuasions, which may faile; as if one should saie, it is reasonable to thinke an honest man will not lye, yet I doubt not but sometimes the cōtrarie happens. Wherefore I pray you tell me

Of what qualitie you thinke these your reasons and discourses be, and whether you conceiue them to beare an absolute certaintie? §. 12

Vncle. I feare it will be to farr on the night before I can satisfie your diffi-

culie, yet I will shew you here only and familiarly what may suffice. Tell me then, doe you thinke there is such a towne as Rome or Constantinople?

Nephew. That I doe, I would I knew what I aske as well.

Vncle. Why, who could you there were anie such townes?

Nephew. Truly I doe not remember who could me so in particular, but I haue heard so manie talke of them without doubting that it were follie to doubt of it.

Vncle. But if I or some other, of whose honestie you doe not doubt, should tell you we haue beene there and haue seene those townes with our owne eyes, would you believe it more certainely then you doe?

Nephew. No in deede, vncle, for although I should, in that case, make no doubt of it, yet their authorities vpon which I doe already beliefe it are no lesse, nay farr greater, seeing that if ie were not so, manie more of no lesse credit and reputation must be lyars, which though I cannot name yet nature tell's me that if thousands had not reported it of their owne knowledge it could not passe so constantly and vncontrowlably as is doth.

Vncle. But if a man should come with manie great reasons and motiues to persuade you, that there is, nor euer was anie such cities as wespeake of. Nay let vs suppose that if you lued but 20 myles from London where euerie day you sawe

hundreth's come from thence, and your self had neuer beene there. And there should come vnto you a man who should labour to shew by reason that it were a follie to thinke there were anie such towne as *Londō*. Or to make our supposition more strong suppose you had liued diuers yeares in London and had neuer seene London Brige which euerie day you might see if you would. And some man would persuade you there were no such thing, what would you doe?

Nephew. I would giue him hearing as I would doe to a foole or a madman, and so much power should his faire reasons preuaile with me. For although I neuer had beene at

London, yet could I not chooſe but know there were a Lond. more certainely the anie learned diſcourſe could make me know anie other thing. For it is as impoſſible that ſo manie men ſhould cõſpire in a lye cõcerning a thing which might be ſo eaſily diſcouered, and that no bodie ſhould cõtradict ſo manie who ſhould dayly ſaye they had ſeene and felt it, as it is that men ſhould be no men. And farr more poſſible for me to be deceiued in a reaſon neuer ſo euident then ſo manie ſo ſwarue ſo farr from humain nature.

Vncle. Why then if you thinke it madneſſe in a man to doubt or not to believe ſuch a thing, what ſtrength doe you conceiue theſe our arguments

must haue, must you not necedes thinke they haue as much force vpō the minde, as colour conueniently disposed hath vpon the eye: as the obiects of smell and taste haue vpon the nose, till and palate: or in deede as a demonstration hath vpon the vnderstanding? And in fine, if anie doe not admitte of these arguments as good, is it not euident that it is not for want of force in the obiect, but of disposition in the person?

Nephon. I confesse it seemes so to me so, yet doe I not see why it must be so, for there's so great difference betwixt naturall things and morall, and the will of man is so much more mutable then nature, that I cannot conceiue how anie certaintie can be had in morall things. Σ

Neede. I see you seeke to engage me into a long discourse but I will cut you short. Doe you thinke it is against nature to tell a lye, or that it is a naturall action?

Nephew. I thinke it is a morall action neither with nor against nature, and I thinke the like of all vertues and vices, nor do I know why I should thinke otherwise.

Neede. You know we say that *children* and *fooles* tell truth, and that fooles are called *Naturalls*, as working by nature. And have you not marked in your self that being asked a question, if you be heedlesse you presently answere the truth, but if you be upon your garde, you considere and resolue how to answere, and

what to conceale. Nay if you haue marked it, you haue neuer could a formall lye, but you haue beene forced to frame a new thing in your minde which before was not in it, so that what nature and the course of learning and speaking breede's would neuer lye. To lye therefore you must haue arte and change some naturall position of your phansie to make or frame it, as if a man would turne his hand or face backewards. And so we saie in latin *mentire est contra mentem ire*, which is to crosse that which is in our mindes. Whereas words are by nature made conformable to our vnderstandings. Whence it is manifest that a lye is against nature and cannot be done but by a

How a lye is framed against nature.

voluntarie resolution to change the course of nature. For although a falsehood may be vttered naturally, if *that* which is false be in our minde, either by setled opinion or by the surprise of inconsideration, yet a *lye*, which is the putting by of that which is naturally in our minde, or at least the hindering of it to manifest it self and the subornation of an other thing to goe out in its place, cannot choose but be voluntary, and done for some end or respect which we ayme at. And the like may be said to proue all vices to be against nature. For if nature be the principle of action in vs, and none who beareth the face of man from the boy that plays at push pinne, to the Bishop

How all vice is against nature.

that nudgeth for heauen, but profesſeth to follow reaſon and exacteſt it of another, no doubt but reaſon is the verie nature of man; Wherefore if vice be nothing elſe but the defect of our action from the rule of reaſon, t is euident that whe we doe anie thing againſt reaſon, we muſt needes worke againſt the nature of man, and conſequently vice is againſt the nature of man. And ſo wee ſee that ma is generally aſhamed of vice, and what he is not aſhamed of, he will not repute to be vice, but will defend it as reaſonable.

Nephew. Giue me leaue to interrupt you in, For I feare I did not well declare my ſelf. It was not my minde to ſaie that reaſon is not the nature of man, But that there

ing difference betwixt the nature of man, which we call reason, compared to his morall actions: and betwixt the nature of other things (as of the elements) compared to their actions. And therefore although philosophers may shew perhapps impossibilities in nature, yet will it be hard to do the like in the actions of *reason*, or rather of the *will*, whose waies seeme to be vncertaine.

Eude. No, cosen, I did not mistake your intention, but I make no difference betwixt the nature of mã and of other things but in excellencie, and I conceiue this excellencie of mans nature to consiste in a greater constãcie of working, and so thinke an impossibili-

tie as eaſily shewed in mans actions as in the actions of anie other nature. For cānot we ſaie of manie things before they be donne, that no wiſe man will doe them, and therefore that who doth them is not wiſe. For example, can you thinke that anie wiſe man will take a ball to cut withall, or a pikeſtaffe to fetch water in? Be not ſuch things as theſes as eaſily knowne, as whether there be anie place without a bodie, or ſtuffed with more then one? Wherefore we may beſure that if a wiſe man goe to fetch water, he will take ſome thing elſe then a pikeſtaffe to fetch it in, or if he be to cut, he will not take a balle; ſo that it is manifeſt reaſō hath as firme principles as anie other

How reaſon come's to faile in anie man,

nature, And that as the nature of one thing will hold vntill a stronger contrarie doe crosse it, so there must be in anie particular man a contrarie disposition stronger then reason in him, to make him goe against reason. Now therefore if you can cast vp the force of reaso and of it's contraries, you may certainely know what a man will doe: which although perhapps you cannot exactly ballance in a particular man, yet in a great number and in whole multitudes you may in some things know it as certainely, as you cā doe anie thing by a demonstration. For exaple, suppose there were an Assembly of graue and wise me, as our Parlement or the like, which had had a verie faire

sunne shyne day to lit on,
And one should tell you that
in the next sessions following
they would decree it had bee-
ne a verie fovle day, and would
commande vnder paine of
death euerie man to believe
and professe soe. Which
though I thinke you will saie
it were impossible they
should make anie such de-
cree, yet would I know how
you would goe about to pro-
ue it. Would you not conside-
re what force of feares or ho-
pes were necessarie to induce
one of these men to tell such a
notorious lye; whereby he
were to hazard his conference
and reputation for euer, and
then increase and augment
the difficultie by the multitu-
de? And further would you

not vrge that there were no such hopes or feares as were able to quell anie one, or at least as were necessarie to ouer-sway them all, considering that the same hopes or feares could not falle vpon such varietie of estates and humours as all these men were of. And knowing certainely anie of these three you would assuredly pronunce the supposed assertion to be false. For saie you, *such* a force is necessarie to breake reason in this Congregation, but *such* a force at this present cannot be had, and therefore reason at this present cannot be broken in them. In which discourse a Mathematician will tell you, his demonstrations hang vpō the verie same grounds. Whe-

refore as men cannot ordinarily demonstrate, that one bodie cannot bee in two places, nor two in one, yet are we certaine there is a naturall demonstration for it, and we are by nature assured of it. So he doubts, but there is a demonstration to him that liueth in London, that there is a London bridge, and he is naturally certaine of it, though he cannot frame the demonstration by articles and sylogismes as a true philosopher can doo, for surely a philosopher, if he will take paines, may finde a demonstration for both.

Nephew. I hartily thake you for this discourse, both for the present subiect, wherein you haue contented me beyond my expection, as also because

methinke's I conceiue by it, that there may be certaine knowledge, not only in mathematikes, but in all other sciences, sithence there is so cleere and efficacious meanes of proceeding euen in morall matters, which seeme the most mutable ād vncertaine of all, and where I thought scarcely anie reason was to be expected.

Vncle. Qicosē, though he was a great man that said *Ars longa, vita brevis*, yet he must giue me leaue to be his interpreter, for t'is not the length of art, but our not taking the right waie, which make's it long, otherwise art would be but a conuenient solace to our liues. Would you thinke that a priuat man following the vatres

without helpe of others writings by his owne industrie should surpasse the greatest clarkes that have pored double his time vpon bookes: and, this our age hath shewed in a french gentelman, yet not only luving but yong.

Monsieur des Cartes.

Nephew. Methinke's, vncle, it were a good worke and neccessarie for the Christian world, if your self or some other would take the paines to set downe the principles of our faith in forme of demonstration. For that I conceiue would take awaie all controuersies, and make all Christians of one beliefe and Religion.

Vncle. You are a yong man, and conceiue not the daintinesse of the pallates of this age, they would not take such

rugged and bitter stuffe, nay they cannot digest anie thing which is not sugered with quaint and pleasant iests. Who would read such a worke? Who would haue the patience to studie it, to comprehend it and make it his owne? This verie discourse which hath passed betwixt you and me is so thornie and full of so manie chained consequences, that were it publike few would carrie it away. Let vs therefore content our selues to make it knowne to our owne acquaintance, to whom vpon occasiõ you may deliuer it by the waie of familiar discourse, wherein peraduenture it will sauour better and profit more.

Nephew. I pray leaue me not thus, giue me at least some spe-

ciall light to answere such obiections, as without doubt will be proposed, when I shall deliuer your discourse to those who are better red then my self. Wherefore least I should disgrace your learned lessons, I pray, tell me how

§.13. *Some cheefe and short obiections may be solued.*

Nele. I can not giue you a better rule the to sticke to the churche's authoritie for *Tradition*, and not to be easily beaten of by great names and words; for if you considere that a *Tradition*, or a point of faith deliuered by tradition, is a point vniuersally preached and deliuered by the Apostles and imprinted in the harts of the Christian world; And by an vniuersall beliefe and practise

ſtiſe continued vnto our days, whereof our warrant is no other then that we finde the preſent church in quiet poſſeſſion of it, and whereof no beginning is knowne, if this I ſaie you conſidere and ſticke well to this apprehēſiō, you neede not feare anie obiection which can be made againſt you. For you rely vpon the teſtimonie of the whole Chriſtiā church, you rely vpon the force of nature borne to continue frō father to child, you rely vpon the promiſes of Ieſus Chriſt of continuing his church vnto the end of the world, And vpon the efficacitie of the Holy Ghoſt ſent to performe it, by whom Chriſt's law was written in Chriſtians harts and ſo to be continued to the da-

of doome, So that your seene humane authoritie, by which our Estates and liues are gouerned; No proofes of courts or law, which neuertheleſſe are admitted as Iuges of thoſe affaires which too manie (God knowe's) esteeme more weightie and important then Religion, No conſent of hiſtorie, And in fine (if what we haue ſaid be true) no demonſtration better, nor greater, nor peraduenture equall. On the other ſide you ſhall finde all obiectiõs fall of their owne weakneſſe. As, ſome doe obiect the Millenarie errour for a tradition, whereof there is no certaintie, nor conſent of thoſe who write of it, whether it haue beene publickly preached by the Apoſtles or no,

And euen thence it is excluded from the nature of such tradition as we rely vpon. Others finding diuers fathers agreeing in one opinion, vrge them presently *for*, or *against*, *tradition*. As if fathers in their dayes were not priuat Doctors, and might not be mistaken in some points as well as the Doctors of the present church. T'is true we reuerence the fathers in manie titles aboue anie liuing Doctors, yet euerie Catholike knowe's that diuers fathers haue some times light into the same error. Wherefore you must note, cosen, that the fathers speake some times as witneses of what the church held in their days, and some times as Doctors, and so t'is often hard to distin-

guish how they deliuer their opinions, because some times they presse scripture or raison as Doctors, and some times to confirme a knowne truth. So that who seeke's Tradition in the fathers and to conuince it by their testimonie, take's a hard taske vpon him, if he goe rigorously to worke and haue a conning Criticke to his Aduersarie. How so euer t'is not a thing fitting for ordinarie and vnlearned people but only for such as haue time at will and great reading and vnderstanding.

Nephew. You haue manie Aduersaries in this opinion, for generally men seeke tradition out of the fathers, and thinke they haue found it, when in euerie age they finde

seuerall fathers of the same opinion.

Vncle. I intende not to detract from their labours who haue taken paines in this kinde, for they are profitable and necessarie for the church of God, and excellent testimonies of *Tradition*, but I nether thinke it to be the bodie of *Tradition*, but only an effect and consequent of it, nor that the multitude of Christians, whose faith is to be regulated by *Tradition*, neede to haue recourse to those learned workes. Wherefore although diuers fathers in the same or different ages be found to contradict some point, whereof the present church is in quiet and immemorable possession, their authorities ought not to

preuaile; nor are they sufficiet to proue there was not euen in their days a contrarie Tradion. For our faith being in some sort naturally grafted in the harts of Christians, learned men may now and then mistake some points of it, as well as the causes and effects of their owne nature it self, according as I tould you but now, And as in other points so euen in this, to wit, in the resolution of faith, wherein as our Doctors seeme to differ now adays, so might the fathers also, And in particular S. Cypria seeme's to thinke that the resolution of faith was to be made into *scripture* and not into *Tradition*, though in deede he opposed not *scripture* to *Tradition*, but to *custome*, which is a

farr different thing, the one relying vpon the doctrine of the Apostles, the other vpon the authoritie of priuat Doctors. And supposing he was mistaken, it were no more thē what wee now see to consiste with the vnitie of the Church. There is one obiection and but only one of moment, and t'is that S. Augustin and Innocentius with their Councells held that the *communion of Children* Was necessarie for their saluatiō, and their words seeme to be apparent. But who looketh into other passages of the same Authors will finde that their words are metaphoricall, and that their meaning is, that the effect of sacramentall Communion, to witt, an incorporation into

Christ's misticall bodie, which is done by Baptisme, is of necessitie for Children's saluation. I remember not at this present anie other obiection of moment which may not be easily solued out of these principles.

Nephew. I will suggest you one or two if you please, The one of Communion vnder both kindes, wherein our Aduersaries saie, we leaue a knowne and practised *tradition* for manie ages. The other concerning the bookes of scripture, where they saie we accept of a new scripture, or rule of faith without tradition.

Vncle. I did thinke, cosen, you could answere these your selfe. For the first there is two parts of it, The one that the

B. Sacrament was giuen vnder both kindes ordinarily, the other that some times it was giuen in one kynd only, And Catholikes being in possessiō of both parts by tradition, those that will proue that Catholikes goe against Tradition must proue that it was neuer administred vnder one kinde only, which our Aduersaries nether goe about nor cā performe, but ply only that part which is granted them, to wit, that ordinarily it was administred vnder both kindes. For the second t'is not sufficient to shew that some haue doubted of this or that part of the Canon, vnlesse they can proue that those who did not doubt, were not a sufficient partie to make a *Tradition* frō

the Apostles time. And so you see it fall's into the question we mentioned before, that some fathers or Doctors being of a contrarie minde breake not the force of tradition.

Nephew. I am loath to leaue you, vncle, because me thinke's I am not sufficiently armed to answere all obiections, And yet what soeuer I call to minde falle's into some of these condicions you require.

Vncle. Let me see how skilfull you are, I will try how you can answere me to

The examples of Tradition which seeme to haue failed.

§. 14. FIrst therefore betwixt Adā's being cast out of Pa-

radiſe and the Deluge there are accoũted about two thouſand yeares, which according to the long liues men enioyed at that time made not fully three deſcẽts, and yet in Noy's time the forgetting of God's law was ſo great that a generall flood was neceſſarie for the cleſing of the world. Sem was Noy's ſonne, and before his death both the Diuiſions of Nations happened, becauſe of their pride againſt God. And (as moſt Hiſtorians thinke) the ſelecting of Abram's familie into God's ſeruice, the reſt of the world hauing abãdoned it. Likewiſe what is become of all antien Religions, the moſt part of them deliuered by Tradition, they are all gone and rooted out. So that

plaine experience is against those fine discourses you approued so higly, What answere would you make to this?

Nephew. Marry I would deny it to be true, I meane I would saie that God's law was not forgotten, but neglected before the floud, And the like at the building of Babell; And for Abraham's time, we know that Abimelech, and Pharao, and Melchisedech, and others (as Iob when soeuer he liued) obserued God's law. As for heathen Religions they were written in bookes, for anie thing I know, and therefore preiudice *tradition* no more then a *written law*, and consequently belong not to this controuersie. And thus I thinke I should quitte my self wel enough.

Vncle. Soone enough at leaſt, but let vs ſee if it be with as good ſpeede as much haſte. For ſuppoſe they ſhould reply that the neglect of God's law muſt of neceſſitie breede oblivion, and therefore that ether God's law was forgotte or shortly would haue beene, if the punishement of the Deluge had not preuẽted it. And for the men you cite of Abraham's time they were but few, and though in that time God's law had yet ſome litle force, looke but into Moſe's time and you ſhall ſee all ouerrune with Idolatrie. For Heathen Religions t'is ſaid of the Druides that their Ceremonies were not written, but deliuered by memorie in verſe from the Elder to the yonger and ſo

conserued; And the Histories of the welch ād Irish seeme to haue beene conserued in the like manner by the Bardes, which how full of fables they were euerie man knowes. So that these things seeme sufficient to discredit *Tradition.*

Nephew. I must intreat your helping hand to fasten me vpo this shaking flore, otherwise I perceiue I am to weake to stand of my self.

Vncle. Tis not the flore you stand vpon, but the want of confidence which makes you so vnsteadfast. For tell me, I pray, if you remember whereon rely's the firmenesse of *Tradition?*

Nephew. You tould me, the *Tradition* of Christian faith was agreat while a planting in

the harts of men by the force of miracles, and that not only in their vnderſtandings but alſo in their wills and affectiõs, and ſo cultiuated vntill the maine of the people were conſtantly perſuaded there was no ſaluation without it. This was done at the ſame time in manie Countries, not knowing one of an other, nor being able to correſpõde and frame anie draught of beliefe together, but euerie one receiuing what was deliuered him from his preacher.

Vncle. Why now then, coſen, returne to your obiectiõs ād looke how they vrge ad what force they haue againſt this your declaration of tradition.

Nephew. As for Adam's children I ſee that one man and

one woman were the only witneſes of ſuch a thing as the partys to whom they tould it could hardly beleiue, it was ſo ſtrange, Nay them ſelues had ſo litle experience of thoſe ſtrange things which they tould, that (for anie thing we know) they neuer as much as taſted of anie fruit in Paradiſe but of the forbidden tree, And what care they had of anie Religion more the to recōmēde God's ſeruice to their children, and that only as log as they liued with them, we know not, ſo that it ſeemes what they taught tooke no ſtrong roote, nor in manie. For Noth the ſame anſwere may be giuen, two of his ſonnes parting shortly from him other into farr countries, or at

least into such a distance, as that they seldome came to see him, Wherefore I perceiue there is a great difference betwixt the deliuerie of Christ's Gospell and of the law of God to those fathers of the old Testament.

Vncle. Your remarkes are good ones; And in deede seeing we haue required that *Tradition* should haue the continuance of nature, We must see that it be plated accordingly, which you haue well noted to haue beene performed in Christ's law, but not in the tradition of the ould law, the fathers and people of that time being much hindered by the great busines of the world's plantation, Euerie ma seeking to plant countries, build cities,

finde out commodities for the cõseruation of man's life. Which were occupations farr different from the thoughts of heauen, and things of the next world. To this you may add that there was not then anie setled orders of Priests and men whose fũctiõ should be to inculcate the necessitie of Religion into men's eares and harts, which we know the Apostles had care to performe euerie where. Againe there was no such correspondẽce betwixt countrie and countrie in those times as hath euer beene amongst Christians, specially by the mediation of a cheefe Bishop which Christ hath set amongst vs. And no doubt but these two last points be two maine and cheefe cau-

ſes of the propagation and conſeruation of Chriſtia faith. You may yet add that eue the points of faith were not then able to worke vpon man's nature ſo powerfully as ſince Chriſt's comming, according to our yeſternight's diſcourſe. So that the roote and ſtregth of Tradition being grounded vpon this, that ſuch a beliefe is fixed in peoples harts of ſeuerall natiõs, the examples faile in three things. Firſt that the multitude was not capable of it, it being ſo ſpirituall and abſtract. Secondly that it was not inculcated with that feruour of ſpirit, aſſiſtance of the holy Ghoſt, and abundance of continuall miracles, as Chriſt's law was. Thirdly that there was not a ſet forme and inſtitution

of Priests and Gouernors to ioyne all nations in communion for the conseruation of their beliefe. Wherefore it neuer had the roote and nature of an vniuersall Traditiõ. And by these examples you may easily answere all other obiections of this nature. And now I will leaue you, least I should ouer wearie both you and my self.

Nephew. You saie well, vncle, yet that I may be sure to haue fully cõceiued the maine drift of your instructions, I pray let me see if I can make

§. 15. *The cõclusion of all our discourse.*

IT was first your intention to giue me a rule how to gouerne my self in the choise of Religion, Then you concluded that scripture could not

be this rule, Where vpon you laid me downe two waies how to resolue my self. The first was that standing vpon the ground of prepossession there was no likelyhood or probabilitie that the Protestants arguments could be sufficient to ouer ballance the Catholikes, because they must be conuincing cleerely or else were to be reiected, And that the Protestants should bring anie cõuincing and demõstratiue arguments against the Catholikes there is no apparence, Catholikes being more in number, in qualitie greater schollers, ād in life more vertuous; And on the contrarie side Protestants hauing no principles or commāde which may make them agree amongst

them selues. And you shewd me that though this persuasiō did not euidently conuince the Catholike faith to be true, yet did it manifestly proue that the Catholike was to be chosen by an vnlearned man. Your second waye was by giuing a direct proofe that the Catholike doctrine is true, which you did in three seuerall manners. First by sheuing that it was no hard matter for the Catholike church to conserue the truth of hir doctrine, if she were carefull, which histories plainely shew she was. Secondly shewing that nature doth force men to haue care of Religiō, and therefore that it was impossible anie error should so creepe into the church as that it should be

vniuersally receiued, the verie nature of man and humane affaires contradicting it's progresse. Thirdly, shewing how the church now relying vpon *Tradition*, must of necessitie haue euer done so, and that if it hath euer done so, it could not let anie falsehood creepe in, nor suffer anie error to be generally admitted. This is all I remember, saiuing the soluing of some obiections and the discouering of some of my impertinent answeres, which I hope you will excuse and forget. If I haue missed I pray direct me.

Vncle. Yo haue taken good notice, and I thinke my paines well bestowed, only I would intreate you to make a litle reflection and compari-

ſon betwixt the knowledge which we haue by theſe meanes, and that which ſcripture affordes vs if we handle it in a litigious waye, as in cõtrouerſies we neceſſarily muſt. And you ſhall finde that Tradition is grounded vpon *that* which all men agree in, and vpon *that* which is common to all ages, all nations, all conditiõs. But the knowledge which we haue by ſcripture is grounded vpon *that* which is different in euerie nation. Hence ſpring's an other differẽce, to wit, that the one is planted in nature, and in what God created in man: the other in what men them ſelues framed, and that not by deſigne or art, but by cuſtome and chance. Out of which againe enſueth that

the

the one is capable of neceſſi-
tie, and conſequently of a per-
fect demonſtration, as all na-
turall things are, the other
not. The one is fixed vpon
vniuerſalls, the other vaga-
bonde in particulars. As for
example who is able to de-
monſtrate that a word in con-
trouerſie hath no other ſenſe
then *that* which is neceſſarie
for his pourpoſe? Or where
the conſtructiō may be made
diuers waies, that the true one
is *that* which he pleadeth?
Who can demonſtrate amōgſt
varieties of texts which was in
the Autograph? Or that the
copies we haue are not defe-
ctiue? And the like, which or-
dinarily are neceſſarie if we
will euindently conuince our
intent out of the place we cho-

ose. On the other side, To shew that whole multitudes of seuerall nations cannot misse in what hath beene a thousand times ouer ad ouer inculcated vnto them, That a world cannot conspire to cosen their posteritie, That mankinde cannot accepte of a doctrine against an euident principle, which they likewise hold and mãtaine (these being the maximes Tradition depende's on) to shew, I saie, these things there needes no deepe learning, being both knowne of them selues, and also as necessarily conioint and dependant of man's nature as his other naturall actions be, and therefore may beare as good a demonstratiõ as they; which if we haue not,

it is not through anie defect or incapacitie of the subiect, but through the want of our looking into it, and that either because we doe not take the right waie, or that we doe not bestow sufficient paines in the prosecution of it. So that in fine although the Roman church had fallen (which is impossible) into those errors which the Protestants pretende, yet were it better for a man to content him self with the Good that remaines in it, then to cast him self into an endlesse and fruitlesse maze of disputations with trouble to all the world, ād that to no other effect, then to make people vnsetled, and by their vnnsetledneſſe to neglect Religion. But God's wisdome (as you

ſee) hath prouided an Euidence for thoſe that will take paines to ſeeke it, 1. that the pointes in controuerſie are of importance and neceſſarie to be knowne, 2. that they cānot be ſo knowne by ſcripture as is requiſite for deciſions againſt contentious men, and 3. that they may be certainely knowne by reſting quiet in the boſome of the Catholike church, which God of his mercie giue you and me grace to doe both liuing and dying.